Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BT990 .B7
Briggs, Charles A MAIN
Theological symbolics
3 9967 00201 0010

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ILLINOIS
SCRIPTURA SACRA
SOLA FIDE
Ex Libris
DR. NILS FORSANDER
LIBRARY

P 90

N. Forsander

The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.,

Sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York;

AND

STEWART D. F. SALMOND, D.D.,

Sometime Principal, and Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS.

BY CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.

85,328

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
ROCK ISLAND ILLINOIS

INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS

BY

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1914

BT
990
.B7

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published February, 1914

To

THE REVEREND

FATHER GIOVANNI GENOCCHI

M S C IN ROME

BELOVED FRIEND AND FELLOW SERVANT

IN CHRIST JESUS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T4-AHV-856

PREFATORY NOTE

This book, undertaken by Dr. Briggs many years ago, was practically complete when his earthly service ended. It had been put in form for the printer, and in large part subjected to a final revision by his own hand. Since that hand was stilled, the process of verification has been carried through by his daughter—long a co-worker—Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, who has also charged herself with the necessary corrections as the book was going through the press. One to whom the teaching and the friendship of Dr. Briggs have been among the choice blessings of life has, likewise, read the proof. The volume has not been edited in any other sense than this. It is Dr. Briggs's own learning and his own convictions—deep and firm ones—that find expression in it. If he could have supervised the printing himself, he might have made minor alterations here and there, but the work represents his mature thought, and is substantially as he would have had it.

No book on Symbolics will command universal assent until the unity of the Church of Christ, which was to Dr. Briggs an object of such intense desire, is actually realized. He designed this one as a means to that great end. In the analysis and comparison of creeds and confessions he was not influenced by zeal for private interpretations, but animated by the longing to bring to view underlying harmonies, and to show the prevailing and essential oneness of the various official statements of belief put forth by the

Church and its divided parts through the Christian centuries. His conception was a large one and the expression of it in this book is profoundly sincere and impressive.

He was single-minded and courageous here, as he always was. He was possessed by the hope that Christian bodies of different name might recognize and accept their kinship. The goal of his endeavor was a broad unity, in the peace of God, reflecting and attesting the Divine Love.

Francis Brown.

Union Theological Seminary,
New York, *January*, 1914.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

Origin, History and Definition of the Discipline . . 3

PART I

FUNDAMENTAL SYMBOLICS

CHAPTER

I. The Creeds of the Church 34

II. The Apostles' Creed 40

III. The Nicene Creed 83

IV. The Athanasian Creed 100

V. The Faith of Chalcedon 109

PART II

PARTICULAR SYMBOLICS

I. Introduction 121

II. Symbols of the Latin Church 123

III. The Origin of the Reformation 144

IV. The Symbols of the Reformation 158

V. The Symbols of the Seventeenth Century . . 200

VI. Roman Catholic Symbols of the Nineteenth Century 221

VII. Protestantism of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries 236

PART III

COMPARATIVE SYMBOLICS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Introduction	251
II.	The Principles of the Reformation	255
III.	The Sacraments	274
IV.	The Doctrines of Faith and Morals	310
V.	The Formula of Concord and Its Opponents	337
VI.	The Synod of Dort and Arminianism	360
VII.	Old and New School Calvinists	373
VIII.	The Westminster Confession and the Conflicts of British Christianity	382
IX.	The Modern Consensus	406
	Index	413

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS

INTRODUCTION

ORIGIN, HISTORY AND DEFINITION OF THE DISCIPLINE

§ 1. *SYMBOLICS, as a theological discipline, is quite modern; but that which it stands for is as ancient as Christianity itself: for so soon as Christianity became conscious of itself, and was recognised as a religion distinct from Judaism, out of which it sprang, it was necessary to define the essential and distinctive principles of the Christian Faith; and it is just the study of this definition which constitutes Symbolics.*

The term *Symbolics* is an anglicised form of the German *Symbolik*, for which English scholars had previously used *Symbolism*. But Symbolism in common usage means the investing of things with a symbolic meaning, or the investigation of the intellectual, moral, and religious meaning of external things. It was therefore important to have a word which would not be ambiguous, but which specifically meant the study of the Symbols of the Christian Faith; and so the German word was anglicised for this purpose.

The term *Symbol* was used for the Apostles' Creed by Cyprian, Augustine, Rufinus, and others, in the third and fourth Christian centuries. The exact meaning of the term is questioned: whether it refers to the composition of the Creed, the putting together in a summary form of the Christian Faith; or to its being a sign, emblem, badge, or banner, about which Christians as soldiers of the Faith should rally. The latter is probably the original meaning; but in fact the Christian Creed has historically embraced both meanings.

The term was gradually extended from the Apostles' Creed to the other ancient creeds.

Σύμβολον means properly *something put together*, especially of two halves. On the one side it attains the meaning of a figurative representation of something in Art or in Literature. On the other side it has the meaning of *sign, token:* either verbal, the parole of the soldier (*tessera militaris*); or something to indicate membership in a society, a token such as a seal ring. Thus the earliest known Christian symbol combined both of these meanings: ΙΧΘΥΣ = Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ, *Jesus Christ, God's Son, Saviour*, whether its use was oral, written, or engraved in the form of the fish itself. It subsequently was applied to the Christian Creed, whose central term was an expansion of the meaning of the Fish, preceded by confession of faith in God the Father, and followed by confession of faith in the Holy Spirit; all based on the baptismal formula of Matthew (28^{19}).

The derivation of σύμβολον from συμβάλλειν, *to put together, compose*—referring to the Apostles' Creed as the putting together of the several items of the Christian faith—was favoured by the tradition that the Creed was composed by the Apostles; but this opinion probably rests upon an earlier view, that it was a summary putting together of the Christian Faith.

Symbol, the term of the Latin writers, Cyprian († 258), *Ep.* 69^{7}, Rufinus († 410), *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum*, Augustine († 430), *de symbolo, sermo ad catechumenos*, and others, gradually gave way in the West to the term *Credo*, the reply of the candidate for baptism to the question: *credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* etc.; but the Easterns continued to use the term *Symbol*.

Tertullian uses the term *regula fidei* (*De præscriptionibus*, c. 13), Irenæus *the rule of Faith* (*Hær.* I : 9^{4}).

The meaning, figurative representation, is retained in most modern languages and in ordinary usage. It is the common meaning in English of *symbol, symbolic*, and *symbolism*. That is the reason why we anglicise the German *Symbolik* for the study of the symbols of the Christian faith. But even in German *Symbolik* retains this meaning, as in Creuzer's *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker* (1810–2), Bähr's *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus* (1837–9), Menzel's *Christlicher Symbolik* (1854).

This usage simply carries on that of the Latin *theologia symbolica*, used with reference to the sacraments and Christian mysteries since Dionysius the Areopagite, and in modern times by Pareus in his *theologia symbolica de sacramentis* (1643).

The term *Symbol* was used at first for the Apostles' Creed. The Nicene Creed, which took up into itself the primitive local creeds of

the East, was at once regarded as a symbol; and so in East and West it became the great symbol of the Church. The Athanasian Creed was subsequently added in the West.

Abelard refers to the Symbol of Ephesus; and so throughout the Middle Ages symbol is used in a general sense. It was usual to interpret the Symbol of the Apostles, and in that interpretation use the Nicene Creed, or the Symbol of the Fathers as it was generally called (*v.* Aquinas in *Symbolum apostolorum expositio*).

Alexander Hales († 1245), gives the three Symbols: the Symbol of the Apostles, the Symbol of the Fathers (the Nicene), and the Symbol of Athanasius, and interprets them in three different articles (*Summa*, III: 69[5], Venice, 1575).

So Durandus († 1296) says: "triplex est symbolum, primum est symbolum apostolorum, quod vocatur symbolum minus . . . secundum symbolum est 'Quicunque vult' . . . tertium est Nicænum . . . vocatur symbolum maius" (*Rationale divin. offic.* 4 c. [25], *de symbolo*, Nuremberg 1480 fol. 53 verso).

So Ludolph of Saxony (fourteenth century): "Sunt autem tria symbola, primum apostolorum, secundum Nicæni concilii, tertium Athanasii; primum factum est ad fidei instructionem, secundum ad fidei explanationem, tertium ad fidei defensionem." (*Vita Jesu Christi*, II: c. 83, Cologne 1487 fol. v. IIII, verso.)

So the Anglican Articles of Religion (1571), in Article VIII, treat "Of the three Creeds."

The Formula of Concord names them: "the primitive church symbols" (*Epitome de compendiaria regula atque norma*, II).

This usage has continued until the present time. I may mention Cnoglerus Q., *symbola tria*, 1606; Vossius, *de tribus symbolis*, opera, 1701; Ernesti, *tria symbola œcumenica*, 1878[3]; Harvey, *History and Theology of the Three Creeds*, 1854.

Luther, however, in his *Drey Symbola* (1536, 1538[2]), gives the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the *Te Deum*, adding the Nicene Creed only by way of supplement. This does not imply any objection on his part to the Nicene Creed; but shows that the term *Symbol* was still flexible in usage.

§ 2. *Fundamental Symbolics is the study of those Symbols of the Christian Faith, which are the common inheritance of historical Christianity.*

The three Creeds—the *Apostles'*, the *Nicene*, and the *Athanasian*—were recognised as ancient summary statements of doctrines contained in Holy Scripture, not only by the Roman Catholic Church, but also by the three great Churches

of the Reformation—the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Church of England. The Greek and Oriental Churches limit themselves to the Nicene Creed; not because they have any objection whatever to the others, but because these have never had much circulation in the East, and their definitions are entirely covered by the Nicene and Chalcedonian formulas. These three Creeds are therefore regarded as ecumenical and fundamental statements of the Christian Faith, ranking next to Holy Scripture in authority.

To these Creeds we must add the doctrinal decisions of the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon and of its successors, which limit themselves for the most part to an interpretation of the Chalcedonian formula over against the Monophysites and the Monothelites.

The Greek, Latin, and Protestant Churches all adhere to these Symbols; and though there are still existing Churches which separated from the Greek Church for political and ecclesiastical reasons as much as for Monophysitism, yet in fact these Monophysites have become so modified in their Faith that, as the Council of Florence indicated, doctrinal differences no longer stand in the way of their union with the Latin and Greek Churches.

Accordingly we may regard these Symbols as the fundamental Symbols of the universal Church, and the study of them as "Fundamental Symbolics."

The theologians of the Middle Ages combined the study of the Creeds and the Fathers with that of the Scriptures under the head of "Positive Theology," and so distinguished the Theology based on the authority of Christ and His Church, from the Scholastic Theology as systematised by the Scholastic theologians in the use of the Aristotelian philosophy. That distinction prevailed until the seventeenth century; and it even survived that century in some Protestant writers, and has continued among Roman Catholics until the present day. Indeed, one of the most characteristic marks of a Liberal Catholic is his cultivation of Positive Theology over against the Scholastic Theology.

At the Reformation the Reformers discarded the Scholastic Theology, and reverted to the Positive Theology, in which they recognised the Scriptures as the only divine authority, but the Creeds of the ancient Church as valid summaries of the doctrines of Scripture; and in their systems of doctrine they endeavoured to give the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture. So Calvin sought his material in the Bible; but his structural principle was not the Aristotelian philosophy, but the order of the Apostles' Creed, which he follows strictly, only making a fourfold division instead of the traditional twelvefold.

The successors of the Reformers in the seventeenth century reintroduced the Aristotelian philosophy as the constructive principle in their systems of Theology; and so gave a newer Scholastic Theology in which they merged the older Positive Theology. And so the distinction between Positive and Scholastic Theology passed out of view. The great Anglican theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries adhered to the Positive Theology of the Creeds, though they made little use of the name.

The Theology of the ancient Church until John of Damascus was Positive Theology without the use of the name; for it was essentially the exposition and unfolding of the doctrines of the Canon of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers. So, also, it continued to be used in the West until the rise of Scholasticism. The study of Christian Theology during all this period was the study of special doctrines such as came into public discussion. The systematisation of Christian theology as Positive Theology began in the cathedral schools during the twelfth century.

Ivo, Bishop of Chartres († 1116 A. D.), in his *Decretum*, combines a systematisation of canon law with Christian doctrine. Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours († 1134), in his *tractatus theologicus*, wrote the first Latin system of doctrine. Abelard († 1142), in his *Sic et Non*, massed Biblical and Patristic authorities in evidence of Christian doctrines to an extent unknown before. Turmel says: "*Le 'Sic et Non' peut être considéré comme la première synthèse à peu près complète de théologie positive*" (*Histoire de la Théologie Positive*, I : xxvi). The *Sentences* of Peter Lombard († 1160) are the culmination of Positive Theology and the basis of Scholastic Theology. His contemporaries, Robert Pullein and Baudin, use the same methods though with less success.

Scholasticism now came in with the Aristotelian philosophy and, under the spell of Albert the Great († 1280), Bonaventura († 1274), and Thomas Aquinas († 1274), dominated theology until the sixteenth century. Its power was broken by the Renaissance and Humanism. It was characteristic of the Reformers, Roman Catholic and Protestant, that they rejected the Scholastic method and reverted to Positive Theology, although the term was seldom used. Melanchthon, who first systematised Lutheran theology in his *Loci Communes*, 1521, rejects the Aristotelian philosophy and builds especially on the Epistle to the Romans. Urbanus Rhegius issued his *Symboli christianae fidei* Δήλωσις in 1527 (English translation, 1543), in which he expounds the Apostles' Creed as the Symbol of the Church, and then gives brief *Loci Communes* in the method of Positive Theology.

Calvin's *Institutes* (1536) is the most important product of the Positive Theology of the sixteenth century. Bullinger also, in his *Summa* (1576), uses the same method; for his work is chiefly an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Sacraments. Peter Martyr Vermigli, in his *Common Places* (1576; Eng., 1583), and Nicholas Hemming, the Danish theologian, in his *Way of Life* (1570; Eng., 1575), use the Biblical principle of the Law and the Gospel. The Roman Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century, especially in Germany, also use the Positive Theology. Erasmus was the great opponent of Scholastic Theology and one of the chief revivers of the Positive Theology. He did enormous service by his editions of the Greek Testament and of the Fathers. So Eck, the chief opponent of Luther, in his *Enchiridion*, 1525 (said to have reached a forty-sixth edition by 1576); Gropper, in his *Institutio Catholica*, 1565, and Hofmeister, in his *Loci Communes*, 1547. The chief difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics was in the emphasis upon the Scriptures by the Protestants and upon the Fathers by the Romanists.

In the meanwhile the term *Symbol* was used by many in the same indefinite sense as in the Middle Ages. Thus Bullinger, in his *Decades*, 1583, uses *symbola* to comprehend, besides the three Creeds, the decisions of the Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon, the First and Fourth of Toledo, confessional extracts from Irenæus and Tertullian, the symbol of Damasus, and the Decree of Gratian. J. Conrad, in his *symbola præcipua*, 1583, adds to the three Creeds, the symbol of Damasus, the *Te Deum*, the symbols of Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople (552 and 682), and other minor councils and confessions.

D. Lambert (*Explicatio symboli apostolici*, 1587) mentions as *orthodoxorum patrum ac conciliorum quorumdam symbola*, after Chalcedon, the two Constantinopolitan decrees against Theodore and the Monothelites, and the edict of Justinian (*v.* Walch, J. G., *Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta*, 1757; I: 303–4, for this and others of a similar kind).

Symbol was also used in a still looser sense. Thus in 1622, at the Jesuit University of Dillingen, three academical discussions were published: C. Paulus, *Symbolum catholicum sive Pontificium collatum cum symbolo apostolico;* M. Riederer, *Symbolum Lutheranum collatum cum symbolo apostolico;* M. Strigelius, *Symbolum Calvinianum collatum cum symbolo apostolico.* These compare the characteristic doctrines of the Pontifical, the Lutheran, and the Reformed with the Apostles' Creed, and thus extend the term *Symbol* so as to virtually correspond with Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Roman doctrines. So Klingius, in *Loci Communes* (1662), uses *symbola* in a general sense for essential articles of the Christian Faith. Similarly the Lutheran Rechenberg (*Appendix Tripartita Isagogica*, 1677–8, 1705), in his commentary on the Apostles' Creed, gives it in order, "*in sensu ecclesiae orthodoxae, in sensu papaeo, in sensu reformatorum, in sensu Arminianorum, in sensu Socinianorum.*"

In the seventeenth century the scholastic methods again came into use in both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, and pushed Positive Theology into the background. The methods of Positive Theology continued in the use of proof-texts and citations from the Fathers; but the dominant method was the Scholastic.

Alsted, the encyclopædist, in his *Methodus sacrosanctae theologiae*, 1614, still divides Didactic Theology into two parts, Positive and Scholastic, the former based on Scripture, the latter arranging doctrines in sentences by philosophy.

Olearius (1678) divides theology into four parts: *Positive* (based on the Scriptures), *Polemic, Exegetical,* and *Moral.* But the term was also attached to Polemic Theology by Ebart, J., *Enchiridion theologia positiva polemica* (1652, 1690[5]), and Kromayer, *theologia positiva polemica* (1668). Ebart defines Positive Theology as that of the prophets and apostles; it is the work of Polemics to defend it.

However, the Anglican theologians adhered to the methods of the Positive Theology in their exposition of the Creeds and their emphasis upon the study of the Scriptures and the Fathers.

Thomas Cartwright, the father of English Presbyterianism, in his *Christian Religion* (1611, 1616[2]), arranges his material on the principle of the Law and the Gospel, as did Vermigli and Hemming, and others before him, but especially in the exposition of selected passages of Scripture under each section. He was followed by the Puritans generally in the use of the structural principle of the Covenants, which they subsequently transmitted to the school of Coccius in Holland.

The irenic efforts of Calixtus and his associates, and the Pietistic movement of Spener and his disciples rejected the Scholastic method and reverted to the historical and Biblical methods; but they seem not to have employed the term *Positive Theology.* And so it passed out of

use in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and has only been revived in recent years by Roman Catholic theologians (*cf.* Turmel, *Histoire de la Théologie Positive*, 2 vols., 1906[3]).

Gradually the disciplines of *Patristics*, *Symbolics*, and *Biblical Theology* arose to take its place and to do its work more comprehensively and thoroughly. The most important recent theological encyclopædists, such as Hagenbach, Kihn, and Schaff, ignore the discipline of Positive Theology altogether.

§ 3. *Particular Symbolics is the study of the Symbols of the separate Churches of Christendom each by itself, in the interest of the particular Church.*

The great calamity of the division of Greek and Latin Christianity was on ecclesiastical rather than on doctrinal lines. The doctrinal differences, so far as they really existed, were settled at the Council of Florence in 1439; and it is only in the interest of the continuation of the separation that any great importance can be attached to them.

The Greek Church adheres strictly to the one Symbol, the Constantinopolitan form of the *Nicene Creed*, as interpreted in the Chalcedonian formula. It felt no need of any other Symbol until it was brought into conflict with the Churches of the Reformation.

The Roman Catholic Church continued to issue definitions of Faith from the time of the separation from the Greeks. There were ten ecumenical Councils between the separation of East and West and the Reformation, the last that of the Lateran, 1512–17, all of which in their doctrinal decisions have like symbolical authority. In addition to these, provincial Councils, whose definitions have been approved by the Popes, are authoritative, such as the Synod of Orange, 529, which decided the doctrines in controversy between Augustinianism and Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism; and the Synod of Rome, 1079, which compelled Berengarius to sign a confession of faith in the doctrine of the conversion of the elements in the Eucharist. All of these were regarded as symbolical in the modern sense in the West, whether the term *symbol* was attached to them or

not; but they were never adopted by the Greeks and Orientals, and so cannot be included under Fundamental Symbolics.

The breaking up of the Western Church at the Reformation resulted in the organisation of a great number of national Churches over against the Roman Catholic Church, which insisted upon being international or supernational. These national Churches issued official declarations of their Faith, no longer in the form of Creeds, but as *Confessions of Faith, Articles of Religion, Catechisms,* and other the like documents. These were all official decisions of particular Churches and became the standards, or banners, of these Churches in the ecclesiastical warfare that characterised the sixteenth century.

It was maintained by all these Churches that their decisions expressed the doctrines of Scripture and that the opposing statements of the other Churches were unscriptural and erroneous. The Roman Catholics alone recognised divine authority in the apostolic tradition expressed in the teaching of the Fathers and the Creeds and the conciliar doctrinal decrees of the Church.

The Lutheran Churches asserted the Faith of the Reformation in the Augsburg Confession with its Apology, composed by Melanchthon, 1530. The Smalcald Articles, 1537, together with the Smaller and Larger Catechisms of Luther, were declared by the Form of Concord to be symbolical. The Form of Concord was soon added to them by the very fact that subscription was required to it in most Lutheran countries; and so these all, with the ecumenical Creeds, were united in the Book of Concord as the symbolical book of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

The stricter Lutherans, toward the close of the sixteenth century, felt the need of a more definite Rule of Faith; and so they began to restrict the term *Symbol* to the ecumenical Creeds, and the official Lutheran declaration of Faith. Accordingly the *Form of Concord* (1578–80) declares the *Augsburg Confession* (1530), together with the *Apology* and the *Smalcald Articles* (1537), to be "the Symbol of our

Age," and the two Catechisms of Luther to be "the Bible of the laity" (*Epitome de compendiaria regula*, III). The Formula of Concord itself was soon added to them. Thus L. Hutter, in his *Libri Christianae concordiae* (1608), takes for granted that it is a symbolical book; and henceforth it closes the numerous collections of Symbols that were made, the whole being combined in the *Book of Concord.* Carpzov, *Isagoge in libros ecclesiarum lutheranarum symbolicos* (1665, 1675², 1691³), gives I, *Tria symbola œcumenica;* II, *Augustanum confessionem ejusque Apologiam;* III, *Articulos Smalcaldicos;* IV and V, *Utrumque catechismum Lutheri;* VI, *Formulam Concordiae.* He defines the symbols as public confessions of the Church, and distinguishes between the ecumenical symbols, and those of particular churches. The Symbols of the Lutherans thus became fixed in the Book of Concord until the present day.

The Reformed Churches produced a large number of symbolical books in the different countries in which they spread. The fundamental Symbols were the "Tetrapolitan Confession" of Bucer and Capito, presented to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, and several local Symbols prepared by Zwingli and Calvin.

The chief Reformed Confessions, however, are the "First Helvetic" (1536), and the "Second Helvetic" (1566), the "Gallican" (1559), the "Belgic" (1561), the "Scottish" (1560), the "Czengerine" (1570), and the "Declaration of Thorn" (1645). The German Reformed have as their chief Symbol the "Heidelberg Catechism" of 1563; but many other smaller independent jurisdictions issued their particular Symbols.

Salnar, in 1581, gathered the ten chief Symbols of the Reformed Churches in his *Harmonia confessionum fidei* (translated into English in 1586 at Cambridge). The purpose of this collection is clear from the title: to show the essential unity of the Reformed Churches over against the Roman Catholic and Lutheran.

The unity of the Reformed Churches was broken on the Continent by the conflict with Arminianism, decided by the general Synod of the Reformed Churches at Dort, in 1618–9, not only against Arminianism, but also for a Scholastic type of theology to which many of the Reformed Churches would

not conform. Still later, in 1675, the *Helvetic Consensus* ruled out of orthodoxy all liberal tendencies in Calvinism.

In the Reformed Churches the term *Confession* was usually employed until quite recent times: *e. g.*, *Harmonia confessionum fidei*, 1581 (English, 1586); *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum Fidei*, 1612; *Sylloge Confessionum*, 1804. It is only in quite recent years that the term *Symbol* has been used by Mess, J. J., *Sammlung Symbolischer Bücher der reformirten Kirche*, 1828–46; Beck, F. A., *Die Symbol. Bücher d. Evang. Reform. Kirche*, 1830; but the older term still prevails, as in the collections of Niemeyer, 1840; Böckel, 1847; Heppe, 1860; Bodemann, 1867²; Müller, 1903.

The Church of England expressed her Faith in the "Forty-two Articles of Religion" of 1553, and the "Thirty-nine" of 1562.

The "Lambeth Articles" were drawn up in 1595, and the "Irish Articles" were adopted by the convocation of the Irish Episcopal Church in 1615. These were in the interest of High Calvinism. They divided rather than harmonised theological opinion, and did not attain any more than temporary symbolical authority. They were, however, favoured by the Puritan party, and lie at the basis of the "Westminster Confession."

The unity of the Churches of Great Britain was broken by the efforts of the Puritan party to bring these Churches into closer conformity with the Reformed Churches of the Continent, with the disparagement of the special features of the Anglican type of Reformation.

The Westminster Assembly endeavoured to unite the four nations, English, Welsh, Irish, and Scotch, about one Confession of Faith, one form of worship, and one government and discipline; but in vain, because the Puritans refused toleration to any other doctrines or institutions but their own. The inevitable result, therefore, was the splitting up of the Church in these nations into a number of different denominations, which continue till the present day, each one of them having its own Symbols of Faith.

The Roman Catholic Church rallied around the Canons

and Decrees of the Council of Trent, 1563, and the Tridentine Confession of Faith of 1564. The dogmatic decrees of the Council of the Vatican, 1870, constitute the latest symbol of the Roman Church. These decrees also extend symbolical character to definitions of faith and morals by the popes *ex cathedra*, such as the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, 1854, of Pius IX, which defined the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin.

It is only in quite recent times that Roman Catholic scholars, influenced by Lutherans, have begun to collect the official doctrinal decisions of the Church under the term *Symbols*; *cf.* Danz, J. L., *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Romano-Catholicæ*, 1836; Streitwolf and Klener, *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, 1836–8. The most widely used is Denzinger, H., *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum*, 1900[9]. He does not distinguish between symbols and definitions, but seems to use them as synonymous terms.

It is indeed a moot question in the Roman Catholic Church where exactly the line of infallibility is to be drawn. This situation justifies to some degree the criticism of many Protestant scholars, that one cannot be sure whether certain decisions have symbolical character or not. At the same time the Roman Church does distinguish between infallible doctrine and doctrine which is authoritative without being infallible; and many Protestant scholars are in error in classifying the *Syllabus* of Pope Pius IX, and other kindred documents, as symbolical. I assert this on the authority of the best Roman theologians and canonists, and of Pope Pius X himself.

In Great Britain and America a large number of denominations have arisen from time to time, each of which has its own standards or principles.

The Congregationalists, or Independents, and the Baptists agreed to the Westminster Confession in its doctrinal parts, and only disagreed as to some Christian institutions. Usually the local churches of the Congregationalists and Baptists have their own confessions or Creeds, to which their members subscribe at their reception into full communion. However, the New England Churches issued the "Cambridge Platform" in 1648, prepared by a Synod at Cambridge, Mass.; and in 1658 the Congregational Churches

of England issued a "Declaration of Faith and Order." The English Baptists agreed upon a similar Confession in 1677, finally adopted in 1689, and agreed to by the American Baptists at Philadelphia in 1742. The Methodists have a revision and condensation of the "Articles of Religion" as their Symbol, adopted at Baltimore in 1784. And so other denominations have their Symbols of various kinds, usually modifications of those already mentioned.

The study of the *Articles of Religion* has been cultivated by Anglicans, and of the *Westminster Confession* by Presbyterians, and of the various other Symbols of other denominations by their representative divines; but little attention has been given to the study of these Symbols in the Reformed and Anglican Churches compared with the activity on this subject among the Lutherans.

Alongside of the systems of doctrine, or newer Scholasticism of the seventeenth century, a study of the Symbols of the particular Church arose, especially among the German Lutherans. At first there was a collecting of the Symbols of the Lutheran Churches; then a general account of them was given in *Introductions;* and finally the theology of these Symbols was given, at first by Rechenberg (1677), and Sanden (1688). Thus the discipline of *Particular Symbolics* originated.

The literature of the Particular Symbols will be given in connection with their study.

It is sufficient to mention the systematic works: Köllner, *Symbolik der lutherischen Kirche,* 1837; *Symbolik der römischen Kirche,* 1844; Klein, *Zur kirchlichen Symbolik,* 1846; Gass, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche,* 1872; Wendt, B., *Symbolik der römisch-katholischen Kirche,* 1880.

§ 4. *Christian Polemics is the study of the differences of the separated Churches, in order to maintain the special articles of Faith of the particular Church over against all others. It therefore emphasises the Dissensus of Christendom, and neglects the Consensus.*

The statement of the variant Faiths of the different Churches gave rise to *Polemics;* and "Polemical Theology" became a very important theological discipline in the seventeenth century. Among the Reformed theologians the term *theologia elenchtica* was preferred to that of *polemica;* but the latter term ultimately prevailed. Both of these words have become anglicised as *polemical* and *elenctical;* but the latter is seldom used in our days. However, Francis Turrettin's *Institutio Theologiae Elenchticae* was used as a textbook by Scotch and American Presbyterians as late as the middle of the last century.

This Polemical Theology, which began with a maintenance of Symbolical doctrines, soon became the special charge of the Scholastic divines; and thus was detached from Positive Theology and Symbolical Theology, and attached to Scholastic Theology.

"Polemics," rightly studied, should build upon the dissensus of the Symbols, and endeavour to maintain the right of the particular Symbol of the religious denomination to which the writer belongs against the supposed errors of other particular Symbols.

As Kihn rightly says (*Encyklopædie der Theologie*, s. 422): "The motive, aim, and fundamental thought of controversial theology must be love for the truth, and reconciliation therewith. Every other Polemic is intolerance, inhumanity; yes, to quote Klee (*Encyklop.* s. 51), bestiality and diablery." But in fact, as Marheinecke says (*Christliche Symbolik*, 1810, s. 46): "None of the older polemic divines has represented the doctrine of his opponents justly and truly. All have brought to every statement the prejudice of both the exclusive rightness of their own and the absolute falseness of the other doctrine."

Polemics began in the sixteenth century with the great battle of the Reformation between the Protestant Reformers and the defenders of the Papacy. In the first stage of the conflict Protestantism made constant victorious progress, because of its appeal to Scripture and the fundamental Symbols over against the tradition and authority of the Church.

After the Council of Trent had made its decisions and

accomplished its reforms, and the Jesuit Order had established its great educational institutions, the tide of battle changed, and the Counter Reformation gained a series of important victories in all the Latin countries, South Germany, Poland, and Hungary, and seriously threatened Protestantism in its chief centres. This was due to a great extent to the reversion of Protestant divines on the Continent to scholastic methods, in which they were easily excelled by their opponents; especially as the mystic element, so prominent in the great mediæval Scholastics, was absent from them, and a hard and dry intellectualism was unrelieved by the warmth of emotion and the vital impulses of the higher religious life.

The conflict culminated in 1680–90 in a literary polemic, probably the most extensive known in history, especially in Great Britain. Protestantism beat back the papal army from Great Britain, Scandinavia, North Germany, Holland, and the greater part of Switzerland; and the lines of division were established, which have remained in all essentials to the present day.

A third period of conflict began with the Council of the Vatican in 1870; but it was impossible to arouse much enthusiasm. It was a scholars' war, in which the people had no interest; and it soon exhausted itself. However, a very extensive polemical literature was produced in a very few years. Besides these great conflicts between the Papacy and Protestantism, a polemic no less serious was carried on between the Reformed and Lutheran on the Continent, and also between the state Churches and dissenting theologians and parties, especially in Holland and Great Britain. These conflicts also produced an extensive polemical literature. Moreover, all of these Churches and denominations waged war against heresies and schisms of various kinds, which not only separated from the national Churches, but abandoned the basis of historical Christianity, and moved away into tangential extremes of unchristian or antichristian theory and practice.

The literature of Polemics is enormous. There is the great conflict between Protestantism and the Roman Catholic theologians in general, sometimes confined to specific doctrines, at others covering the whole ground of difference. Then, again, each Protestant nation has its own special polemic with Rome. The Polemic within Protestantism itself is just as serious and extensive; on the Continent between the Lutheran and Reformed, and in Great Britain between the Churches established by law and the non-conforming and dissenting bodies. And there is also the conflict of all the divisions of historical Christianity against the numerous heresies and sects, ancient and modern.

The literature of the great conflicts since the Reformation will be given in connection with the Symbols about which the conflict raged, in our study of them in Comparative Symbolics. It will be sufficient here to call attention to the different modes of polemic as indicated in the titles of some of the most important volumes, published in the different stages of the conflict.

(1) The emphasis in the sixteenth century was upon heresies, schisms, and errors.

Lutzenburgus, B., *catalogus hæreticorum*, 1523.
Dietenberger, J., *Phimostomus Scriptuariorum contra hæreticos*, 1532.
Bullinger, H., *de origine erroris*, 1539, 1568.
Hosius, *Treatise of the beginning of heresies*, 1565.
Barthlet, J., *Pedigree of Heretiques*, 1566.
Hessels, J., *Confutatio cuisdem Hæreticos*, 1567.

(2) A little later the method changed to a statement of differences, or controversies.

Alberus, Erasmus, *Unterschied d. Evangelischen u. Papistischen*, 1539.
Pighius, Albertus, *controversiae præcipuae*, 1542.
Bullinger, H., *Gegensatz evang. u. röm. Lehre*, 1571.
Andreä, J., *Von den Spaltungen*, 1574.
Aspileneta, M., *Enchiridion, sive Manuale Controversiarum*, 1575.
Cunerus, P., *Tract. de controversiis*, 1583.
Coster, F., *Enchiridion controversiarum*, 1585.
Valentia, G., *de rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis*, 1591.
Huber, S., *Gegensatz Luth. u. Calv. Lehr.*, 1592.
Vasquez, *Controversiarum*, 1595.
Osiander, L., *Enchiridion Controversiarum*, 1602–3; English, *Manuell or brief volume of Controversies of Religion between the Protestants and the Papists*, 1606.

(3) In the seventeenth century a milder spirit modifies the polemic method, and the historical method comes into the field.

Bossuet, *Histoire des Variations des Églises Protestantes*, 1688.
Du Pin, *Histoire des Controverses*, 1699.
Buddeus, J. F., *Hist. u. Theol. Einleitung in d. Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 1728.

Rambach, *Hist. Einleitung in d. Streitigkeiten*, 1738.
Baumgarten, *Geschichte Religionsparteyen*, 1766.
Dannenmayer, M., *Hist. succincta controversiarum*, 1780.

(4) In the eighteenth century Polemics becomes a discipline, and at first in the Reformed Churches.

Turrettin, F., *Institutio theologiae elenchticae*, 1682–8.
Fabricius, *Disputatio de theologia elenchtica*, 1702.
Bechmann, F., *Theologia Polemica*, 1719.
Bernhold, J. B., *Compendium Polemicae*, 1734.
Gerdes, Dan., *Elenchus veritatum, circa quas defendendas versatur theologia elenchtica*, 1740.
Stapferus, J. F., *Institutio theologiae polemicae*, 1743.
Pichler, V., *theologia polemica*, 1746.
Schubert, J. E., *Institutio theologiae polemicae*, 1756.
Wyttenbach, *Theologiae elenchticae initia*, 1763–5.

(5) In the nineteenth century Polemics was little cultivated. We may mention:

Hase, K., *Handbuch d. prot. Polemik*, 1865², 1894⁶.
Tschackert, P., *Evangelische Polemik*, 1885, 1888².

Accordingly Polemics, in the main, was unfruitful of good and only productive of evil; because it was not based upon valid distinctions, it was not carried on in the proper spirit, and the methods were those of a special pleader who magnifies the differences and misrepresents the opponent, seeking for victory over the antagonist rather than for a vindication of the truth. It was only natural, therefore, that this method should abandon the ground of Symbols, and attach itself to the Scholastic Theology.

Thus Polemics became discredited, and in modern Theology has been well-nigh abandoned. There is, however, room for it, if it be carried on upon the basis of the Symbols themselves, and especially after a thorough comparative study of them, which has in a scholarly and unbiassed way already made the discrimination between the concord and the discord of Christendom; has already weighed each statement in the scales of accurate measurement in the due proportions of the theological system.

On this sound basis, with a conviction of the truth and accuracy of the particular symbol, it is quite proper that it

should be maintained in a dignified and scholarly way against opposing statements; and these statements may be critically examined and their errors exposed. It is not probable, however, that Polemics will be much cultivated in this generation; for there is a remarkable lack of enthusiasm for the differences between the religious bodies among scholars really competent to distinguish them properly and to maintain them.

§ 5. *Christian Irenics is the study of the differences of the separate Churches, in order to solve them and harmonise them. It emphasises the consensus, and tends to depreciate the dissensus.*

Christian Irenics arose in opposition to Polemics. In the early days of irenic effort, chiefly by men on the border lines, where different denominations coexisted, many helpful discriminations were made, which were of permanent use.

Irenic movements began in the period of the Reformation itself. Martin Bucer and Philip Melanchthon were the chief peacemakers on the Protestant side, John Gropper and Julius v. Pflug on the side of Rome, in the early stages of the Reformation, and many differences were resolved, especially at Augsburg and Ratisbon; but political and ecclesiastical interests were in the way of any valid reconciliation.

Ferdinand of Austria encouraged Friedrich Nausea, and especially George Witzel, a pupil of Erasmus, who in his *Methodus concordiae ecclesiasticae* (1537) urged reforms in doctrinal statements and ecclesiastical usages, and in his *Via Regia* (1564) proposed the laying aside of scholastic dogmatism and a return to the simplicity of doctrine and usage of the early Church. The Roman Catholic George Cassander, in his *De officio* (1561) and his *Consultatio* (1564), exposes in a mild and gentle way the inconsistencies of the Protestant Reformers. He considers the differences in an irenic spirit, and makes useful proposals for reconciliation, especially in the doctrine of the Eucharist. The most important of these are the following:

(1) The authority of Scripture and of apostolic tradition as witnessed by the primitive Councils and Fathers; (2) the jurisdiction of the Pope, restricted to the limits set by Jesus Christ and the early Church; (3) the doctrinal differences as adjusted by the conference at Ratisbon; (4) the Mass a remembrance and representation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ continued in heaven.

These positions were adopted in all essentials by John Forbes in 1620, in his *Considerationes modestae;* and by Grotius in 1641, in his republication of Cassander with annotations.

Other efforts were made in the seventeenth century. The most useful of these was probably that of Rupertus Meldenius. His golden sentence of peace, *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque charitas,* was taken from Conrad Berg by Richard Baxter, and so became current in the Anglo-Saxon world.*

His personality and residence have not been discovered, notwithstanding the researches of many scholars. His *Parœnesis Votiva,* issued about 1626, is of extreme rarity. The copy I examined is in the Royal Library of Berlin. The work gained recognition through the volume of Conrad Berg, *Praxis Catholica.* This also I consulted in the same library, which contains the only copy preserved, so far as I know, except one, which I was able to secure a short time ago, after hunting for it many years.

The chief irenic divine of the first quarter of the seventeenth century was George Calixtus of Helmstädt, who sought a basis for reunion in the Christian consensus of the first five centuries. These men and their associates were called *Syncretists,* because they sought to harmonise and combine the doctrines of the different Churches in one. Their opponents thought the differences irreconcilable, and so accused them of indifference to the distinctive doctrines of these Churches. But syncretism is simply the combination of

* Briggs, *Origin of the Phrase "In Necessariis Unitas," etc., Presbyterian Review,* July, 1887, pp. 496 *seq.*

elements, or principles, in unity. All great religions are syncretistic. And no union is possible without syncretism, or combinations of some kind. Such syncretisms may be, and often are, heterogeneous combinations, as in ancient Gnostic sects, and their recent imitators. Other syncretisms underrate and neglect important differences. But neither of these faults is inherent or necessarily involved in irenic syncretisms.

John Dury, the great peacemaker of the middle of the century, tried to rally the Christians of his time on what he called *Practical Theology;* that is, such doctrines of Faith and Morals as were not scholastic, but of practical importance.*

A Professor of Aberdeen, toward the close of the century, issued an anonymous tract called *Comparative Theology,* in which he tried to get a basis for union in the theological principles he determined in this way. His work had little influence in Great Britain, but it was reproduced in Holland, and was helpful there. These irenic movements were still in the particularistic stage. They dealt with certain prominent questions, but were not sufficiently comprehensive. The questions neglected were raised up as obstacles by their opponents. The pragmatic study of the concord and discord of Christendom, and of the relative weight and just proportion of the differences in the Positive Theology of the Church, was necessary to successful irenic movement. Not until "Comparative Symbolics" had been thoroughly studied could there be a sound Christian Irenic.

At the close of the seventeenth century there was a tremendous struggle for reunion all over the world. Theological literature from 1680–1700 is for the most part either polemic or irenic in that interest. The most important irenic movement is that headed on the Continent by the Roman Catholic, Spinola, General of the Franciscans, and the great philosopher Leibnitz, sustained at one time by a Pope, the

* Briggs, *The Work of John Duric; Presbyterian Review,* April, 1887, pp. 297 *seq.*

Curia at Rome, and a General of the Jesuits, but strangely enough opposed by Bossuet and the Gallican party, largely from political interests.

Many useful proposals were made and entertained at Rome, such as (1) the use of the older term *conversion* rather than the scholastic *transubstantiation;* (2) that faith justifies not absolutely, but as the root of all justification; (3) the limitation of papal authority by a constitution, with freedom for the different provinces of the Church in local affairs.

Though this irenic movement failed, the polemic also failed; but they were both instructive, and no one can understand the real state of the controversy between Protestants and Rome unless he has thoroughly studied both of these movements.

Some of the older writers distinguish between "Irenics" and "Henotics." "Irenics" is a plural of *irenic*, an adjective from the Greek εἰρηνικός, *peaceful, pacific.* "Henotics" is a plural of *henotic*, from the Greek ἑνωτικός, *serving to unite, unifying.*

If we were strictly to adhere to the meaning of these terms, "Irenics" would be the discipline that seeks to promote peace and harmony among the religious bodies; and we should have to use "Henotics" for the effort to promote union. But henotic movements have absorbed irenic ones; and so the term "Irenics" has come to be used to embrace all movements for *union* as well as *peace.* And it is certainly best to combine them: for although many movements for peace have been made, and still will continue to be made without going any further, yet they are all, in fact, preparatory to the bringing about of that much greater and more fruitful work, the Reunion of Christ's Church.

§ 6. *Comparative Symbolics is the objective study of the Symbols, either of some or of all the Christian Churches, in the interest of historic truth and fact, to determine their historic relations, their consensus and dissensus.*

The excesses of Polemic on the one hand, and the failures of Irenic on the other, opened the eyes of scholars to the necessity of a pragmatic study of the differences between the Churches. This was begun by Planck in 1796. On the basis of his work Marheinecke, in 1810, published the first *Christliche Symbolik;* and Winer his useful comparative study in 1824, but without using the term *Symbolics.* Möhler then came into the field, in 1832, with his *Symbolik,* which determined the terminology of the discipline subsequently, although it was productive of a long controversy in which many Christian scholars on all sides took part.

Thus as Polemic may be conducted with an irenic spirit, and Irenic with a polemic spirit, so it is difficult to maintain the purely objective critical and historic study that *Symbolik* demands, and is easy to fall back into Polemics.

From that date the majority of writers on this subject have used the term *Symbolik,* with or without appropriate defining adjectives, and usually with explanatory sub-titles. But a considerable number have continued to follow Planck and Winer in the use of other terminology for the discipline.

J. G. Planck originated the department of *Comparative Symbolics* in his *Abriss einer historischen und vergleichenden Darstellung der dogmatischen Systeme unserer verschiedenen christlichen Hauptpartheyen nach ihren Grundbegriffen, ihren daraus abgeleiteten Unterscheidungslehren und ihren praktischen Folgen,* 1796, 1822[3].

The first to use the term *Symbolik* for this discipline was P. Marheinecke in his *Christliche Symbolik, oder historisch-kritische und dogmatisch-komparative Darstellung des katholischen, lutherischen, reformirten und Socinianischen Lehrbegriffs nebst einem Abriss der Lehre und Verfassung der übrigen occidentalischen Religionspartheyen, wie auch der griechischen Kirche,* 1810–3. He states that he lectured for many years on Planck's *Abriss* before he undertook this work of his life.

The first words of his Introduction are to the effect that Polemic had battled itself to death, and now substantially, in another form, had risen as Symbolics. Marheinecke was unable to complete this extensive work; but he issued a complete outline: *Institutiones Symbolicae,* 1812, 1830[3]. Charles Butler published his *Historical and Literary Account of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith, or Symbolical Books of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Principal Protestant Churches,*

1816. The material is chiefly historical; yet the purpose is a comparative study, and there is a concluding Essay on the *Reunion of Christians.*

J. G. B. Winer next published his useful *Comparative Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchenparteien,* 1824 (English, 1873; ed. Ewald, 1882).

J. A. Möhler now came into the field with his *Symbolik,* 1832 (1889[10]; English, 1843), which provoked a long controversy, but doubtless fixed the terminology of the discipline. Unfortunately Möhler limits Symbolics to the differences of doctrine which arose in the Revolution of the sixteenth century, as he calls it; and he devotes more than a quarter of his work to the sects, which he regards as legitimate children of Protestantism. Many of the chief Protestant scholars regarded his work as polemic rather than the irenic that he designed, and sharply attacked it:

Marheinecke, *Ueber Möhler's Symbolik,* 1833.

Baur, F. C., *Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus,* 1834, 1836[2].

Nitzsch, C., *Protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhler's,* 1835.

Hase, K., *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik gegen die römisch-katholische Kirche,* 1862, 1894[6].

Neander, A., *Katholicismus und Protestantismus,* ed. Messner, 1863.

Möhler replied to Baur in *Neue Untersuchungen,* and Baur to Möhler in *Erwiederung auf Möhler,* 1834, 1836. Other replies were also made: (*v.* Friedrich, J., *Möhler der Symboliker,* 1894).

The influence of Möhler limited the discipline to the differences in doctrine between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants among most Roman Catholic scholars; whereas Protestant scholars use it in the more comprehensive sense, and discuss the Symbols of all Christian Churches.

The chief works on Comparative Symbolics, in addition to those already mentioned, are the following:

(1) Those which use the term *Comparative* with various terms referring to the Symbols:

Tafel, J. F., *Vergleichende Darstellung und Beurtheilung der Lehrgegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten,* 1835.

Bodemann, F. W., *Vergleichende Darstellung der Unterscheidungslehren der vier christlichen Hauptconfessionen,* 1842, 1869[2].

Schneckenburger, M., *Vergleichende Darstellung des Lutherischen und Reformirten Lehrbegriffs,* 1855.

St. Aldegonde, M. de, *Tableau des differends de la religion,* 1857.

Sartorius, E., *Vergleichende Würdigung evangelisch-lutherischer und römisch-katholischer Lehre,* 1859.

Kattenbusch, F., *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde,* I, 1892.

(2) Those which use the term *Symbolik*, either with or without the use of the term *Comparative* in title or sub-title:

Köllner, E., *Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen*, 1837–44.

Guericke, *Allgemeine christliche Symbolik*, 1839, 1861[3].

Hilgers, B. J., *Symbolische Theologie, oder die Lehrgegensätze des Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, 1841.

Buchmann, J., *Populärsymbolik, oder vergleichende Darstellung der Glaubensgegensätze zwischen Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, 1850.

Baier, A. H., *Symbolik der christlichen Confessionen und Religionspartheien*, 1853–4.

Matthes, K., *Comparative Symbolik*, 1854.

Hofmann, R., *Symbolik, oder systematische Darstellung des symbol. Lehrbegriffs der verschied. christl. Kirchen und namhaften Secten*, 1857.

Karsten, H., *Populäre Symbolik*, 1860–3.

Plitt, G., *Grundriss der Symbolik*, 1875, 1888[2].

Oehler, G. F., *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, 1876, 1891[2].

Schéele, K. H. G. v., *Theologische Symbolik*, 1877 (German, 1881); also *Symbolik*, 1883, in Zöckler's Handbooks.

Philippi, F. A., *Symbolik*, 1883.

Gumlich, G. A., *Kurzgefasste christliche Symbolik*, 1889[2], 1910[6].

Schmidt, H., *Handbuch der Symbolik*, 1890.

Müller, E. F. K., *Symbolik, Vergleichende Darstellung der christlichen Hauptkirchen nach ihrem Grundzuge und ihren wesentlichen Lebensäusserungen*, 1896.

Nösgen, K. F., *Symbolik*, 1897.

Burg, J., *Symbolik*, 1899.

Loofs, F., *Symbolik, oder christliche Konfessionskunde*, I, 1902.

Comparative Symbolics presupposes the preliminary study of *Fundamental Symbolics* and *Particular Symbolics*. It leaves out of view all the introductory historical questions which belong to these preliminary parts of our discipline, in order to devote itself to the subject-matter of doctrines of Faith and Morals contained in these Symbols; and studies these doctrines not so much in the structure and form of the Symbols in which they are stated as in their relations to each other, in the variant statements of the same doctrines, and in their emphasis upon different doctrines: for the purpose of this study is to ascertain how far there is agreement and concord, and how far there is disagreement and discord.

These then are the three great divisions of Symbolics:

(1) *Fundamental* Symbolics, the study of the Ecumenical Creeds and Conciliar Decrees.

(2) *Particular* Symbolics, the study of the Symbols of the particular Churches.

(3) *Comparative* Symbolics, the study of the Symbols in order to determine their consensus and dissensus; and this in three different interests—the *Polemic*, the *Irenic*, and the *Pragmatic*.

§ 7. *Christian Symbolics limits itself to the Symbols of Christian Churches, those that adhere to historical Christianity and its fundamental Symbols. The doctrinal statements of the various sects, which have separated from historical Christianity and its fundamental Faith, cannot rightly be included in this discipline.*

The question necessarily arises as to the limits of the discipline. There have always been sects of various kinds which have arisen from time to time to take their place outside of historic Christianity. Some of them are such heterogeneous mixtures of Christianity with various philosophies, or ethnic religions, that, like the Gnostic sects, they have no right to the Christian name. Others, such as the Montanists and Donatists, adhered to the fundamental Faith of the Church, and so remained Christian when they separated from organic Christianity and thus lost their right to a part in the Christian Church. Their special beliefs, whether expressed in official documents or in the statements of their Fathers, have never, so far as I know, been considered as having a place in Christian Symbolics.

The same position must be taken consistently with regard to mediæval and modern sects, some of which are truly Christian, others not, as they have departed from the fundamental Symbols and institutions of the Christian Church. This is to treat them not unfairly, but in accordance with the doctrines and institutions which are their distinctive characteristics.

All Symbols of Faith that are truly legitimate are based upon the fundamental Symbols of the undivided Church. If there should be any that depart from them, they cannot be considered as legitimate Symbols of the Church. The same is true of the fundamental institutions of the Church. If any religious body rejects the Christian Sacraments or an ordained ministry in apostolical succession, it may be Christian in other respects, but it is not a part of the organism of Christianity.

The inclusion of the Faith of modern heretical sects in the discipline of Symbols by many writers from various motives makes the limits of the discipline altogether uncertain, because their number and variety is much greater than that of the historic Churches. It is impracticable to state with sufficient thoroughness and accuracy their relation to one another and to historical Christianity within the bounds of the discipline. It is usually difficult to determine whether they have any really official statements, or not. The definition of Symbol has to be made extremely elastic in order to include them. There is no propriety in including modern sects and excluding ancient and mediæval sects, especially if, as is often the case, they have really held to the same things.

The inclusion of the sects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Comparative Symbolics tends insensibly to change the objective treatment of the Symbols into Polemics, as was evident in the controversy originated by Möhler. On the other hand, it tends to confuse the distinction between Church and sect, the legitimate Faith of the Church and illegitimate forms. There is no valid reason to stop with those sects that bear the name of Christian; for if you are to include the Swedenborgians, Mormons, and Christian Scientists, there is no valid reason why you should not consider also the Buddhists, Parsees, Zoroastrians, and Mohammedans, as W. A. Curtis has done in his *History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith in Christendom and Beyond*, 1911; and then we have passed from Comparative Christian Symbolics into the more comprehensive field of Comparative Religion.

§ 8. *Christian Symbolics is limited to the study of Symbols of Faith. Christian Institutions developed side by side with the Christian Faith, have their official statements, and may be studied as fundamental, particular, and comparative institutions from the same points of view: yet the two departments*

have usually been kept apart, and may be readily distinguished; so that it is better to regard them as separate disciplines.

So long as the Symbols of Faith were considered by themselves, it was quite easy to separate their study from that of Christian Institutions; and the same situation continued, though with some difficulty, when we had to consider the particular Symbols of the Christian Churches on the Continent of Europe, where the discipline of *Symbolics* arose, and where alone it was studied until quite recent times. But so soon as "Comparative Symbolics" came into the field for serious and comprehensive study, the situation gradually changed. So long as the comparison was chiefly between the Lutheran and Reformed Symbols of the Continent, no need was felt to go beyond the field of doctrine; because institutional differences were slight, and of little comparative importance. Even in the comparison of Roman with Protestant Symbols it was not difficult to confine the study to doctrines of Faith and Morals, and to refer institutional differences to the disciplines of Liturgics and Church Law. But when it came to a serious study of the differences between the Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches, it became evident that the doctrinal differences were really merged in the more important institutional differences; and so the three chief writers on Symbols of recent times—Kattenbusch, Müller, and Loofs—insist upon the inclusion of institutions with doctrine in the discipline of Symbolics.

The probable reason why "Symbolics" has excited so little interest in Great Britain and America is that the chief differences between the religious denominations are not doctrinal but institutional. The names of the Churches of America, apart from those that originated on the Continent of Europe and so are transplanted continental terms, are institutional names: Protestant Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and the like. The same is true in common usage in Great Britain likewise. If therefore any one wishes to make a comparative study of the consensus and dissensus of British and American Christianity,

he must pay more attention to religious institutions than to doctrines of Faith and Morals.

Religious institutions, no less than doctrines, depend for the most part upon official documents of the Churches. Indeed, it has been quite common to include the Symbols under Religious Institutions, as do Stanley and A. V. G. Allen, making the latter the more comprehensive term. From the point of view of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, there is some justification for this. Religious institutions belong to the religious life of the Church; Creeds and Confessions of Faith to the doctrinal or more intellectual side of Christianity; and Christian Ethics to the moral side. The three departments may be distinguished, or combined, according to circumstances. From the point of view of theological encyclopædia, they are sometimes combined and sometimes distributed in different parts of the system. If the comparative study of the consensus and dissensus of the Churches is the chief motive, they certainly belong together.

It will not do to classify all under Christian Institutions, because the discipline of Symbolics originated in Germany, and has been cultivated chiefly there. It has won its right by long study and an extensive literature; whereas the comparative study of Christian institutions is quite recent. Moreover the Creeds and Confessions are institutional only in part, so far as they are used in the institutions of worship, government, and discipline of the Church; whereas their chief importance is in the intellectual sphere, as doctrines of Faith.

The question naturally arises whether we shall follow the recent German writers on Symbolics, and class Institutions under that head.

The term *Symbol* has, for so many centuries, been associated with Creeds and official statements of the Faith of the Church, that one hesitates to extend it so as to cover religious institutions: and yet on the other hand there is no reason, so far as the term *Symbol* itself is concerned, why it should not be thus extended; for the credal statement is

no more a symbol, or badge, of a religious body than its forms of worship, or its system of government. Moreover, the Symbols of the Churches since the Reformation do, in fact, include institutions as well as doctrines.

It is necessary, if we wish to know what any particular Church stands for and what is the consensus of Christianity, to study the Liturgies and Canons of the Church as well as the Creeds and Confessions. It is, however, convenient to treat of the Creeds in one course of instruction and of the Institutions in another.

It would be much better, if scholars could agree upon some more comprehensive term, such as *Comparative Theology*, to include both these departments of study. It is noteworthy that Kattenbusch and Loofs, both of whom published the first of their volumes on Symbolics years ago, have not as yet been able to complete their work. The fact is that they both overload their volumes with the study of Christian Institutions, and they find that they have undertaken a much more difficult task than they imagined. The discipline has been extended so as to become impracticable, and the Institutions in Kattenbusch crowd the Faith.

Christian Institutions have three great divisions: (1) *Institutions of Worship*, (2) *Institutions of Government and Discipline*, and (3) *Institutions of Education*. Institutions of Worship have as their authority Liturgies and other formulas of worship, usually studied under the head of Liturgics. Institutions of Government and Discipline have as their authority Canons of Councils treated usually under the head of Church Government and Canon Law. The usual classification of Liturgies and Canon Law under the head of "Practical Theology" emphasises the practical side of these great studies to the neglect of the historical and systematic sides.

The same distinction between *fundamental*, *particular*, and *comparative* must be made here as in the case of Symbols of Faith. There are the fundamental Liturgies of the Christian Church, and there are the fundamental Canons of Councils, upon which all Christian Institution depends. There

are also fundamental principles and methods of Christian Education.

When the Greek and Roman Churches separated, the differences in institution developed more rapidly than those of doctrine, in the liturgies, ceremonies, and Canon Law of the separated Churches.

The Protestant Reformation itself was due more to institutional differences than to doctrinal ones; although after the division more stress was laid upon the doctrinal in controversy, not, indeed, in Great Britain, but on the Continent of Europe. The Roman Catholic Church revised its Liturgy, and constrained all parts of the Church to the Roman Breviary and the Roman Missal and ceremonial. The Canon Law was also revised, and made of universal obligation. Each of the Protestant Churches developed its own peculiar institutions. There is a group of Lutheran Liturgies, another of Reformed Calvinistic Liturgies. Here the Church of England makes a third group with its *Book of Common Prayer*.

So also in canons of government and discipline we have the Lutheran consistorial government, the Calvinistic presbyterial, and the Anglican episcopal governments, all with canons, laws and rules of various kinds regulating them. The types of Christian Education are also different, especially for the training of the ministry.

The English Revolution left the Church of England in the midst of a group of dissenting Churches, differing from her as to worship and government in almost every variety of conception, from the full liturgy of the Church of England, through the partial liturgy of the Church of Scotland, to the entire absence of liturgy among several non-conforming bodies. The Baptists separate on the question of the subjects of baptism and mode of baptism. The Quakers, or Friends, celebrate the sacraments in spirit, but not in the letter. Every variety of church government and church law developed in different organisations, some of which contend for their peculiarities as if they were the very es-

sence of divine Scriptural authority. Each one of these denominations, each group of them, has its own particular institutions of worship and of government, regulated by official documents of these bodies, each requiring special study by the adherents of the particular body.

We have finally the Comparative study of Institutions. This study distinguishes first the primitive Christian Institutions of the undivided Church from the particular Institutions of the separate Churches. It then groups these separate Churches, and classifies their liturgical books and canons of law. Finally it seeks the consensus and dissensus of Christendom in this regard.

The institutions of Christianity have, however, their doctrinal principles, which give shape and organisation to them. These doctrinal principles of Institutions must be considered in Christian Symbolics, and it is not difficult to separate them from the institutions in which they are enveloped.

Thus the doctrine of the Eucharist is one thing, the Eucharist as an institution expressing the doctrine is another thing. So the doctrine of the Holy Ministry is one thing, the organisation of the Ministry into an institution is another thing. The doctrine is the essential thing; its organised expression, though highly important, is not so essential. So the Roman Catholic Church limits infallibility to doctrines of Faith and Morals, and excludes Christian Institutions from infallibility. This fact alone is a sufficient reason for the separation of them into different departments of study.

PART I

FUNDAMENTAL SYMBOLICS

CHAPTER I

THE CREEDS OF THE CHURCH

§ 1. *There are three Creeds of the Church: the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed.*

The term *Creed* is from the initial Latin word, *credo, I believe.* This singular was always used as the first word of the Apostles' Creed, so far as we know; although there are references to it by certain Latin writers, in which the plural *credimus* is used.

The Nicene Creed, also, has the singular, *credo,* in the usage of the Western Church; although there are not a few ancient forms of it that use the plural; as was the case in the original Greek Nicene Creed, πιστεύομεν, and in the general usage of the local creeds of the Eastern Churches. However, examples of the use of the singular are known. The use of the singular was doubtless due to the recitation of the Creed in the ceremony of baptism, when the candidate was asked, according to the ancient rituals, continued until the present time in somewhat varying form: *Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* with the answer: *Credo.* The question and answer were usually uttered thrice for the three parts of the Creed, once for each person of the Holy Trinity. The singular, *Credo,* expresses therefore the personal faith. The plural of the Nicene Creed expresses the common faith of the Church. Where the singular is used, it must be regarded

as the organic singular, the Church or congregation speaking in the consciousness of its unity as *I*.

The Athanasian Creed begins in a more dogmatic way, and makes the personal or common faith *objective*, as the Faith of the Church, which it is necessary to believe for salvation.

These three Creeds are the official Creeds of the Christian Church, all three of Western Christendom; but the Greeks and Orientals limit themselves to the Nicene Creed, which took up into itself earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed of the Eastern Churches, superseding it in baptismal as well as in other liturgical uses. The Athanasian Creed is a purely Western symbol, giving an interpretation of the Nicene Creed in Western terminology; but there is nothing in it that is not in strict accordance with the Greek interpretation of the Creed of Nicæa, except the *filioque*, where the difference is more nominal than real.

These Creeds express officially the Faith of the Church in that stage of development which had been reached at the time they were composed: the Faith of the fundamental centuries of the Christian Church, the heroic age of Christianity, the age of the Fathers of the Church. The Faith of that age, as expressed in its official Creeds, has always been regarded as the fundamental Christian Faith of the Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern Church.

§ 2. *These three Creeds, like many other ancient documents, bear names to which strictly they are not entitled, but which in a more general sense are fully justified. They have not remained in their original integrity, but have been enlarged and adapted gradually in their public use. These changes have not impaired their authority; for they have been officially recognised, and for centuries established in the use of the Churches.*

The Apostles' Creed was not composed by the Apostles, but does in fact set forth the Apostolic Faith. We do not know when the legend of apostolic authorship arose; but it could not have been later than the third century, for

Rufinus, in his Commentary on the Creed of the last quarter of the fourth century, says: "Our forefathers have handed down to us the tradition."* This assignment of the Creed to the Apostles corresponds with similar assignments of other documents such as the *Didache,* or *Teaching of the Apostles,* the *Didascalia,* the *Constitution of the Apostles,* and other like primitive writings. There is behind the legend the fact that Tertullian, Irenæus, and all other early Christian writers, regarded the Creed as apostolic in its statement of the Christian Faith.

The Nicene Creed in its present form is an enlargement and modification of the original Creed of Nicæa, as finally adopted by the Council of Chalcedon; but essentially it is the Creed of Nicæa.

The Athanasian Creed was not composed by Athanasius: but it does set forth the Faith for which Athanasius stands historically more than any other, although that Faith is stated in a Western rather than an Alexandrian form, and is nearer to Augustine than to Athanasius. Substantially the names are justified, but not formally and technically.

No one of these Creeds is in its original form. They have been slightly modified and considerably enlarged, but the additions and modifications do not in any way impair their original meaning. They simply interpret, explain, and unfold the Creeds, and state what had been the common teaching of the Church from the beginning. Therefore they were not questioned.

§ 3. *The three Creeds have been studied in a very extensive literature from the earliest to the present time.*

In collections of Symbols and in Comparative Symbolics they have been regarded as fundamental. In dogmatic treatises, written by orthodox divines, they have been referred to as authorities next to Holy Scripture. In Church Histories they have received their historical position and

* *Expos. Symb. Apost.* II; *v. Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* series 2, vol. III, p. 542.

influence. In Pastoral Theology they have been considered in connection with Catechetics and the Sacramental Liturgies. Besides there is an extensive special literature upon them.

In the ancient Church the chief writers on the Symbols were Ambrose († 397), Rufinus († 410), Augustine († 430), and Niceta, Bishop of Remesiana, early in the fifth century. In the Middle Ages the writers on Positive Theology and Scholastic Theology all used the three Creeds as fundamental authorities. At the Reformation they were regarded as second only to the Sacred Scriptures in authority. Erasmus, Urbanus Rhegius, and Bullinger expounded the Apostles' Creed; Luther the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian, and the *Te Deum;* Melanchthon and Cruciger († 1548) the Nicene Creed. Calvin constructed his *Institutes* in the order of the Apostles' Creed. Most of the Catechisms of the Reformation included the exposition of the Apostles' Creed. In the Church of England, Field (1581) and Bishop Hooper (1581) wrote expositions of the Apostles' Creed.

In the first half of the seventeenth century in England Perkins (1616) and Bifield (1626) expounded the Apostles' Creed, and Archbishop Ussher wrote his monumental work upon it (1647), giving a review and classification of the different forms of the Symbol so far as known in his time.

On the Continent Pareus expounded the Athanasian Creed (1618); Cnoglerus (1606) and Vossius the three Creeds (1642).

In the last half of the century numerous writers appear, among whom we may mention:

In England, J. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, who wrote his standard *Exposition of the Creed* in 1659, bringing together a mass of historical information from a large number of ancient writers. His work passed through many editions (1692^{6}, 1701^{7}, 1830, 1847, 1850, 1859 +), and is still a textbook in Anglican theological schools. I may also mention Heylyn (1673), and Barrow on the Apostles' Creed (Works, 1683, 1700, 1830 +); G. Bull on the Nicene Creed (1687, 1851); and John Wallis on the Athanasian (1691).

On the Continent, Witsius (1681, 1697) and Tentzel (1692) wrote on the Apostles' Creed; Baier on the Nicene (1695); Montfaucon (1698) on the Athanasian; and Heidegger on the three Creeds (1675–80).

In the eighteenth century the chief work was that of P. King on the *History of the Apostles' Creed*, interpreting it in relation to the heresies of the times (1702, 1719[4]); and D. Waterland on the Athanasian Creed (1723, 1728; Works, 1843[2], 1870).

On the Continent the three Creeds were discussed by C. G. F. Walch (1770), J. E. I. Walch (1772). Fecht (1711), Ittig (1712), Suicer (1718), and Holsten (1748) wrote on the Nicene Creed and Speroni (1750) on the Athanasian.

In the early nineteenth century several works appeared on the Apostles' Creed: Schwab (1828), Rudelbach (1844), Meyers (1849), all in Germany; and in England, Radcliffe on the Creed of Athanasius (1844).

In the middle of the century great interest in the Creeds became manifest, and numerous scholars wrote on the subject in Great Britain: on the Creeds in general, (1) Hammond (1850); (2) Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica* (1854, 1858), *De Fide et Symbolo* (1869, English 1886), *History of Earlier Formularies of Faith* (1892); (3) Swainson, *Creeds of the Church* (1858), *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds* (1875); (4) Harvey, *History and Theology of the Three Creeds* (1854).

On the Continent, also, there was a revived interest. Caspari, in his thoroughgoing researches into the origin of the Apostles' Creed, put the whole subject on a new basis. His works are monumental in character: *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete, und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, 3 Bde. (1866–75); *Alte und Neue Quellen* (1879).

Von Zezschwitz, in his *System der christlichen Katechetik* (1863–9), also gave valuable work, especially on the practical side. In France, Nicolas (1867) discussed the Apostles' Creed, and Révillant that of Nicæa (1867).

In 1872 Lisco made an attack upon the Apostles' Creed, which greatly agitated Germany, and called forth much dis-

cussion, in which many eminent divines took part, especially in favour of the Creed; among whom we may mention Semisch, Zöckler, Gass (1872), Mücke (1873), Von der Goltz (1873), Harnack, A. (1877), Ernesti (1878[3]), Hahn (1877[2], 1897[3]). The conflict was renewed, in 1892, by Harnack's *Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, which stirred up a widespread discussion by Zahn (1893, trans. 1899), Bäumer (1893), Bernoulli (1896), Kunze (1898), and especially Kattenbusch, who, building on Caspari, yet greatly advanced the historic exposition of the Creed: *Das Apostolische Symbolum* (1894, 1900[2], 1904); *Beiträge zur Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufsymbols* (1892); *Zur Würdigung des Apostolikums* (1892).

The discussion in Germany had to do almost exclusively with the Apostles' Creed, whereas in England and America the discussion embraced all the Creeds. In great measure the discussion in England was independent of that on the Continent until Harnack's time, but the Anglican divines have come into the field against him. The earlier discussions in England were more in the interest of Catholicity. Discussion of the Creeds in general has been made by Lumby, *History of the Creeds* (1873, 1887[3]); Hort, F. J. A., *Two Dissertations* (1876), and Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (1877, 1890[5]). The Athanasian Creed has been especially considered because of the objections to its use in the Anglican Liturgy: by Stanley, A. P. (1871); Ffoulkes, E. S. (1872); Hardy (1873), and Richey (1884). Since 1892 important work has been done especially by Burn, A. E., *Introduction to the Creeds* (1899), *Nicene Creed* (1909); Bindley, T. H., *Œcumenical Documents of the Faith* (1899, 1906[2]); Wm. Sanday, in *Journal of Theological Studies* (1899); McGiffert, A. C., *The Apostles' Creed* (1902); Swete, H. B., *The Apostles' Creed* (1899, 1905).

CHAPTER II

THE APOSTLES' CREED

§ 1. *The Apostles' Creed in its present form may be traced to about* 700 *A.D., about which time it was probably revised officially in Rome. An earlier form is quoted by several writers of the fourth century.*

Pirminius, a Benedictine missionary of the middle of the eighth century, Abbot of Reichenau, quotes it in modern form (*Dicta Abbatis Pirminii*). It is also given in this same form in the Psalter of Gregory III (731–741).*

Rufinus, a priest of Aquileia, wrote a Commentary on the Creed (*Expositio Symboli Apostolici*), in the last quarter of the fourth century, in which he compares the Creed of Rome with the Creed of Aquileia. He says that all candidates for baptism were required to recite it publicly, and that no alterations were allowed. The form had doubtless been fixed, and as it were stereotyped, officially in Rome. A Greek form of the same Creed is given by Marcellus of Ancyra (337–341). This form is also confirmed by the commentaries of Ambrose and Augustine, by the Psalter of Æthelstan, and by other witnesses (*v.* Schaff II, pp. 47–48; Burn, p. 200).

§ 2. *The Apostles' Creed may be traced to the middle of the second century by distinct references to it in Irenæus and Tertullian.*

The reason that the Apostles' Creed does not appear in

* For details of evidence *v.* Caspari, *Anecdota*, p. 151; Burn, *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 233 *seq.* For the text in Latin, Greek, and English *v.* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, II, p. 45; for the Latin text *v.* Burn, p. 240.

literature is supposed to be the necessity that the Church was under, in times of persecution, of keeping secret her essential institutions. The Creed as a symbol, used in the ceremony of baptism, would thus be kept secret. The only references to it that one can expect are references to its statements of Faith, and these not such as to give the exact formula.

Nevertheless there are phrases of the Creed that seem to be so fixed in usage as to imply that they were well-known forms of words. It seems probable that in Rome about the middle of the second century the Creed was revised into the form which underlies the statements of the writers of the second and third centuries. Many attempts have been made to ascertain the exact form of the Creed of the second century on the basis of three references to it in Irenæus (*c.* 180 A.D. *Adv. Hæreses,* I:10[1], III:4[1, 2], IV:33[7]); and three in Tertullian (*c.* 200 A.D. *De Virginibus Velandis,* 1; *Adv. Praxeam,* 2; *De Præscript. Hæret.* 13); confirmed by Cyprian (*c.* 250 A.D. *Ep.* 69, 70), Origen (*c.* 230 A.D. *De Principiis,* I:4–6), and the numerous Eastern Creeds. There are differences as to details, but general agreement as to most articles.

The following arrangement of the Creed exhibits its three stages of development according to my opinion. The form of the second century is given in small capitals, additions of the fourth century in italics, those of the seventh century in ordinary type. The words in brackets were omitted in later forms.

The Apostles' Creed

I BELIEVE

I. IN [ONE] GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, Maker of heaven and earth:

II. 1—AND IN JESUS CHRIST [GOD'S SON], *His only Son,* OUR LORD:

2—*Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,* BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY:

3—Suffered UNDER PONTIUS PILATE, was CRUCIFIED, dead, AND BURIED: He descended into hell:

4—THE THIRD DAY [RISEN] *He rose again* FROM THE DEAD:

5—*He* ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN:

6—AND [SEATED] *sitteth* ON THE RIGHT HAND OF *God* THE FATHER *Almighty:*

7—FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

III. 1—[AND] IN THE HOLY GHOST:

2—THE HOLY catholic CHURCH, the communion of saints:

3—THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS:

4—THE RESURRECTION OF THE [FLESH] body, and the life everlasting.

Amen.

§ 3. *The Apostles' Creed originated on the basis of the triune formula of baptism, and the necessity for a baptismal profession of faith. The triune original expanded into twelve articles, in order to express the six saving acts of Jesus Christ, and the three of the Holy Spirit.*

The formula of baptism was originally, *into My name, the name of Jesus Christ,* Acts 2^{38}, 10^{48}; *the name of the Lord Jesus,* Acts 8^{16}, 19^{5}; *into Christ Jesus,* Rom. 6^{3}; *into Christ,* Gal. 3^{27}; *into the name of the Lord, Didache* 11, Hermas (*Vis.* III:7); *into the name of the Son of God,* Hermas (*Sim.* IX:13, 16, 17). But the *Didache* 7 gives the triune formula based on Matthew, which throws it back into the first century; and there is no reason to doubt that it was original in our Gospel of Matthew, and that it represents Christian usage of the last quarter of the first century.* The two formulas existed side by side through the second century. The shorter one was defended as valid by St. Ambrose, St.

* *V.* Briggs, *Apostolic Commission,* in *Studies in Honour of Basil L. Gildersleeve,* 1902, pp. 1–18.

Thomas Aquinas, and other Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and has always been so recognised.

It is evident from the statements of the New Testament that a confession of faith in Jesus Christ was necessary in order to baptism. The primitive Christians were also Jews. The fundamental Faith of Israel was *the Unity of God.* For Jews who became Christians, that was presupposed; but when converts were made from among the Gentiles, it was necessary that they should confess *the Unity of God* as well as *the Messiahship of Jesus.* Furthermore, faith in the Holy Spirit was required in order to baptism, as is evident from Acts 19^{1-7}; *cf.* John 3^{3} *seq.*, and the formula of baptism, Mt. 28^{19}.

Thus we have in the New Testament clear evidence as to the three constituents of the Creed:

(1) The one God, Yahweh, of the Old Testament religion.

(2) Jesus as Lord, Christ, Son of God.

(3) The Holy Spirit.

And so we may say that all candidates for baptism in apostolic times must have professed their faith in these three essential doctrines of the Christian religion. These three things constitute the Creed, and all else is a development of these three elements.

The most ancient Creed known, apart from the old Roman Creed, is the short Creed of the Church of Jerusalem (Cyril, *Cat.* XIX): *πιστεύω εἰς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας.*

This the candidate for baptism said, according to Cyril. The fourth item simply gives what was required for baptism by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, and what has always been required, namely, repentance in order to remission of sins.

Therefore we may go back of the Creed of the second century to an original Christian Creed of the first century, which simply contained a Trinitarian Creed:

πιστεύω

I. *εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα,*

II. *καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Θεοῦ υἱὸν σωτῆρα,*

III. *καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.*

The first clause expresses *the unity of God.* *Παντοκράτορα* = צבאות is used instead of יהוה, *Yahweh, Lord;* because *Lord* had become a special title of Christ among primitive Christians.

The second clause is the phrase of the symbol of the Fish, ΙΧΘΥΣ: *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ* = *Jesus Christ, God's Son, Saviour,* the secret symbol and token of the primitive Christians. The term *Saviour* was subsequently expanded into the six saving acts of Jesus.

The third clause expresses faith in the Holy Spirit, which was subsequently expanded into the three saving acts of the divine Spirit in the organisation and guidance of the Church, in the remission of sins at baptism, and in the final resurrection of the body.

§ 4. *The first article of the Creed was originally a confession of faith in the one personal God of the Old Testament, and all that was implied therein.* Father *was inserted in the apostolic age in the Christian sense of the Father of Jesus Christ.* Maker of Heaven and earth *was finally added to emphasise the doctrine of creation.*

The first article of the Creed is based on the שמע (Deut. 6^{4-5}), so called from its initial Hebrew word: שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך ובכל מאדך.

This was followed by vv. 6–9, and then by Deut. 11^{13-21} and Num. 15^{37-41}. This *Shema* was the Confession of Faith, the Creed of Israel, said at morning and evening worship, with appropriate prayers of the nature of ascriptions to God, called *Benedictions.* Josephus (*Ant.* $4^{8,\ 13}$) testifies that this was the custom among the Jews from remote antiquity, therefore undoubtedly in the time of Jesus and of Jesus Himself.

Jesus attests the *Shema* (Mark 12^{28-30}). There can be no doubt as to the meaning of this Creed to Him and to His

apostles: (1) It asserts that the God of the Old Testament was *really God*, excluding every kind of Atheism; (2) that He was the *one only God*, excluding Polytheism; (3) that He was the *personal God* of Israel, excluding Pantheism; (4) that *love* was the most important relation between God and His people as moral beings.

This fundamental faith of Israel was implied in all Jewish converts to Christianity, and so in all Gentiles who became Christians. It was then necessary that it should be put into a Christian form. The formula which would have come over from Judaism was: *Yahweh our God, Yahweh is One.* This was transformed into the personal relation: *I believe in one God, Yahweh. Yahweh*, in the time of Jesus, was a secret name; not used, but always represented by *Lord*, as in the citation by Jesus, in the Greek version by Κύριος, in the Hebrew by אדני. But the term *Lord* was so attached to Jesus Christ by His disciples, that it was not used for the God of Israel in the Pauline Epistles, except in citation from the Old Testament.* Accordingly another term was necessary to indicate the God of the Old Testament. The most natural one was צבאות, which is usually associated with יהוה in the Prophets, and which had itself become a proper name.† This was favoured by its use in the New Testament: transliterated in Rom. 9^{29}, James 5^{4}, and translated *παντοκράτωρ*, II Cor. 6^{18}; Rev. 1^{8}, 4^{8}, 11^{17}, 15^{3}, $16^{7,\ 14}$, $19^{6,15}$, 21^{22}. Accordingly, we have in the Christian Creed *εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα.* The Greek word, which means *all ruler*, does not express the exact sense of the original Hebrew, *God of Hosts* or *armies:* the Latin *omnipotentem* and the English *Almighty* also give variant conceptions. It is easy to draw nice distinctions between these terms, but without any advantage, for in fact *παντοκράτορα* in the Creed was nothing more than a proper name to identify the God of the Christian with *Yahweh Sabaoth* of the Hebrews.

* *V.* Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 86–87.

† *V.* my article in Robinson's *Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon*, new edition, BDB.

In the baptismal formula the phrase was *into the name of the Father.* It was inevitable therefore that *Father* should appear in the Creed soon after the baptismal formula appeared in Matthew and the *Didache.* There can be no doubt as to the meaning of *Father* in the baptismal formula, and it is improbable that it would be used in the Creed in any other sense. It is *Father of Jesus Christ, His only Son,* and so it has always been understood in the Creed. As the *one God Sabaoth* implied the entire Old Testament doctrine of God, so the term *Father* implies all that was additional in the New Testament doctrine of God.

The Creed of the fourth century has no longer *one God* but only *God;* probably because it was not necessary at that time to emphasise the unity of God over against polytheism, and in order to avoid a misinterpretation of this article of the Creed in the interests of Monarchianism and Arianism. The phrase *Maker of heaven and earth* was not in the Creed of the fourth century, but is found in Creeds of the eighth century; probably owing to the influence of Eastern Creeds, and in order to emphasise the doctrine of creation.

§ 5. *The second article of the Creed expresses faith in Jesus as the Messiah of the Old Testament, and as the Son of God and Lord God of the New Testament.*

It is altogether probable that the original form of this article corresponded with the meaning of the symbol of the Fish: *Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour.*

It is improbable that these two formulas, that of the Creed and that of the Fish, identical in meaning, were different in form when they both were secret symbols; for the memory, especially that of untrained people, would have been confused by even slight verbal differences. The σωτῆρα was omitted when the *salvation* was described in the six subordinate articles that follow, and the more comprehensive *our Lord* was put in its place. All this is simply the putting together of the most characteristic titles of Jesus ascribed to Him in the New Testament.

The fundamental confession of faith is that of St. Peter, the spokesman of the apostles. This is given in the four Gospels in the simplest and original form: *Thou art the Messiah* (Mark 8^{29}).

The Book of Acts and the Epistles have a large number of passages, which clearly show that salvation in apostolic preaching depended simply upon believing that Jesus was the Messiah, Son of God, Lord, Saviour (Acts 2^{36-38}, 5^{31}, 8^{37}, 9^{20}, 16^{31}; I Cor. 12^{3}; Rom. 10^{9-10}; I John 4^{15}, $5^{1,\ 5}$). These terms all came into the Creed.

(1) *Jesus Christ.*

The name *Jesus* was the proper name of Jesus of Nazareth, given Him at His birth (Luke 2^{21}), and explained thus: "For it is He that shall save His people from their sins" (Mt. 1^{21}). Doubtless therefore it had the meaning of *Saviour:* but in fact it is used in the New Testament and subsequently as a proper name; and when it is necessary to distinguish the Lord Jesus from others of the same name, He is called *Jesus of Nazareth.* The term *Christ* is a transliteration of the Greek Χριστός, a translation of the Hebrew משיח, *Messiah.* This means properly *one anointed* by a religious ceremony to a holy office. It came to be attached in Jewish usage to the one predicted by the Old Testament prophets, sometimes as Son of David, sometimes as a prophet (*cf.* Mt. 16^{13-16}). It is evident from the New Testament that the apostles regarded Jesus as the Messiah of Prophecy.*

There can be no doubt that the early Christians at Rome, as elsewhere, constituted a Messianic community; and that when they said, *I believe in Jesus Christ,* they meant that they believed that *Jesus was the Christ, the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy.*

(2) The second item in this clause of the Creed was originally *God's Son,* in accordance with the symbol of the Fish. The order of the two words was changed from that of the symbol of the Fish to the usual order of the New Tes-

* *V.* Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy, Messiah of the Gospels,* and *Messiah of the Apostles.*

tament in the Creed of the second century. The term *Son of God* was primarily a Messianic title (Ex. 4^{22-23}; Deut. 32^{6} *seq.*; II Sam. 7^{11-16}.* Probably it has this sense in Mark 1^{11} and Mt. 26^{63-64}. But it is evident that the term rises in the Gospels to the higher sense of divinity, in the logion, Luke 10^{22}=Mt. 11^{27}, and especially in the phrase *Son of the Father*, characteristic of the Gospel of John.† The pre-existence of Christ is plainly taught in several Epistles of St. Paul, and is definitely attached to the term *Son of God* in Col. 1^{13}. In the Gospel of Mark, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Revelation, *the Son of God* is identified with *Yahweh*, the personal name of God of the Old Testament (Mark 1^{1-3}; Heb. 1^{1} *seq.*; Rev. 1^{10-20}.‡

During the period of the conflict with the Modalists *the Son of God* was changed into *His Son*, in order to make it clear that Jesus Christ was the *Son of the Father* of the first article, and so to exclude the Modalists.

The Church in the second and third centuries was troubled by heretical teachers, who in their doctrine of Christ were essentially unitarian. They are named Monarchians by Tertullian. He says: "They are constantly throwing out the accusation that we preach two gods, and three gods . . . 'We hold,' they say, 'the monarchy.'" (*Adv. Prax.* 3). There were two kinds of these Monarchians, the dynamic and the modalistic. The dynamic originated in Asia Minor, in reaction against the Montanists. The chief representatives of these were excommunicated: Theodotus, the Currier, by Pope Victor (*c.* 195 A.D.), and Artemon by Pope Zephyrinus (*c.* 240). The ablest representative of this School was Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, excommunicated by a Council in Antioch (*c.* 268). These regarded the Son of God as simply a divinely inhabited man.

The Modalists were much more powerful and influential;

* *V.* Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 101 *seq.*, 127.
† *V.* Briggs, *Incarnation of the Lord*, pp. 33 *seq.*
‡ *V.* Briggs, *Incarnation*, pp. 175 *seq.*; and *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 442 *seq.*

as they were not only concerned to maintain the unity of God, but also the divinity of Jesus Christ. According to Tertullian, Praxeas was the first to import this heresy into Rome. "He drove out the Paraclete and crucified the Father" (*Adv. Prax.* 1). They were called Patripassians, because they made Father, Son, and Spirit only different manifestations of the One God; and so it was the Father who suffered in the Son. The chief Modalist at the beginning of the third century was Sabellius, who indeed gave his name to this form of heresy. The term *Son of God* in the Creed might be interpreted by the Modalists in accordance with these views; but it was much more difficult to so explain *His Son,* that is, the Son of the Father of the first article.

In the Creed of the fourth century the term τὸν μονογενῆ, *the only begotten,* appears attached to *His Son.* This doubtless was inserted owing to the influence of Eastern Creeds, on the basis of the Gospel of John (1^{14}), to exclude not only Modalism but Arianism. This designation of the Son as *the only begotten* emphasises His uniqueness not only as the *only* Son, but also as a *begotten* Son and therefore not an *adopted* Son, or a manifestation of God as Son. It excludes both kinds of Monarchianism. It represents that Jesus is the Son of God in the highest sense as *begotten,* and not *made* or *created,* and as having therefore the same nature, being, and substance as the Father who begot Him. It therefore excludes Arianism as well.*

(3) *Our Lord.*

This was in the Creed of the fourth century, and also in that of the second century according to all the chief writers on the Creed. The originality of *our Lord* in the Creed is strongly favoured by the usage of the New Testament and the chief writers of the second century, who use *Lord* in the sense of *Lord God* for Jesus Christ, rather than for God the Father (*v.* p. 102). In Latin writers, under the influence of

* *V.* the fuller discussion in chapter III, in the study of the Nicene Creed; also Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith,* pp. 226 *seq.*

Augustine († 430) and his emphasis upon the sovereignty of God, *Lord* is seldom used for Jesus Christ, but more commonly for God the Father. In the Athanasian Creed *Lordship* is ascribed to the three Persons of the Trinity in the same sense. It is difficult to see what motive could have induced the insertion of *Lord* in the second article of the Creed later than the second century. Furthermore *Lord* is in all the primitive Eastern Creeds.

The term *Lord* is in itself an indefinite term, and has a variety of meanings; but there can be no doubt that it is used in the sense of divinity, when applied to Jesus in the New Testament and early Christian writers, on the basis of the custom of Hellenistic and Palestinian Jews alike, of using *Lord* for the *Yahweh* of the Old Testament. We may refer especially to the confession of St. Thomas, John. 20^{28}; the words of St. Peter, Acts 2^{36}; the teaching of St. Paul, I Cor. 8^{5-6}, Phil. 2^{5-11}, and his salutations, Rom. 1^{7}, Gal. 1^{3}, Eph. 1^{2}, and to numerous other passages. The three terms advance to a climax:

(1) *The Christ*, the Messiah of the Old Testament and of Jewish expectation;

(2) *The Son of God*, the only begotten and pre-existent Son of the Father of the New Testament;

(3) *The Lord God*, the revealer of the Father, both as the Yahweh of the Old Testament and as the supreme Lord of the New Testament.

§ 6. *The term Saviour of the Symbol of the Fish, and presumably of a very early form of the second article of the Creed, was explained in six following articles by six successive saving acts of the Son of God.*

Articles III–VIII of the Apostles' Creed received minor modifications in its historic use, but these six articles were all there without doubt early in the second Christian century. It is altogether probable that they all came into the Creed at the same time; for it is difficult to see how any early Christian, who undertook to give a complete statement of the

redemptive acts of Jesus, could have omitted any one of them. It is true that one finds in the New Testament and Christian writers of the second century not infrequently two or more of them and seldom the entire six in any one statement; but these writers, with the exception of Irenæus and Tertullian, did not give credal statements, but only used such of the redemptive acts of Jesus as suited their purpose at the time. Even Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* I : 10), in his statement of the Christian Faith, omits the *Session at the right hand of the Father;* but that is implied between the Ascension and the Second Advent, as usually in the New Testament. Justin Martyr gives 1, 2, 3, and 4 together thrice in the same order (*Apology*, 21, 46; *Dialogue with Trypho*, 63), but 5 and 6 elsewhere. Indeed emphasis upon these is characteristic of his dialogue with Trypho throughout. There can be no doubt that Ignatius gives all six in his epistles as essential Christian doctrines, although only 1, 2, 3 in the order of the Creed (*Ep. Smyr.* 1).

St. Peter in his preaching emphasised the resurrection of Christ, but also 2, 4, 5, 6, all but the Virgin birth, which was omitted for valid reasons, to be given later (Acts 1^{21-32}, 2^{22} *seq.*, 5^{20-21} + *v.* p. 55). St. Paul also regarded the resurrection as the fundamental principle of his teaching (I Cor. 15^{1} *seq.*); but all of the six saving acts of Christ stand out prominently in his teaching except the Virgin birth, for which, however, other terms are used (*v.* p. 56). All of them are not given in any one passage; but there are several groups: 2, 3 (Rom. 6^{4} *seq.*), 1, 2, 4, 5 (Phil. 2^{5} *seq.; cf.* I Tim. 3^{16} for a credal hymn). In the writings ascribed to St. John the doctrine of the Incarnation becomes most prominent; but the other saving acts are given either explicitly or implicitly, though not combined in any single statement. The same is true of other New Testament writings.

The six saving acts of Jesus are all given distinctly in the teaching of the apostles; and there can be no doubt that they would all appear in the Creed just so soon as an attempt was made to formulate them.

The Incarnation implies all the others; for the entrance of the Son of God into the world implies His return to the Father, after the accomplishment of His work of salvation in the world. The first Advent implies a second, if indeed He was the Messiah of the Old Testament. The Death implies the Resurrection, if there is to be a second Advent. The Resurrection, in the usage of St. Paul, is often used for the whole work from the tomb to the throne. The Enthronement is for the purpose of the Reign, and the second Advent is for the ultimate Judgment. These, then, are the six successive redemptive acts or states of Jesus the Saviour:

(1) *Born of Mary the Virgin,*
(2) *Crucified under Pontius Pilate,*
(3) *On the third day risen from the dead,*
(4) *Ascended into the heavens,*
(5) *Seated on the right hand of the Father,*
(6) *Thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.*

§ 7. *The third section of the Creed originally expressed faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God as "born of Mary the Virgin." This implied a divine agency in His conception, which is later expressed in the Creed by the addition of the phrase, at first "of the Holy Spirit," and later "conceived by the Holy Spirit."*

The Creed of the eighth century was: *qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine;* that of the fourth century: *qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine;* that of the second century only: *τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.*

It is evident from the six forms of the Creed in Tertullian and Irenæus that their formula was, *born of Mary the Virgin.* Irenæus follows the Gospel of John and the earliest Eastern Creeds in his terms *made flesh* and *becoming man,* and in giving the purpose: *for our salvation* (*Adv. Hær.* I : 10^1, III: 4^2, IV : 33^7). No one can read with attention Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho,* Irenæus' *Against Heresies,* Hippolytus' *Refutation of All Heresies,* and Tertullian's *Of the Flesh of Christ*—writings which cover the whole period from the third

decade of the second century to the same decade of the third century, overlapping one another in linked succession—without observing that the essential argument against Jew and heretic was just the virgin birth of our Lord. The only sects claiming to be Christian that denied the virgin birth were the Ebionites, who held that Jesus was only a man, and the Gnostics, who distinguished between the man Jesus and the Christ which descended upon him and took possession of him.

There can be no doubt that the doctrine of the virgin birth in the Creed is based upon the statements of the Gospel of Luke; though Justin and Irenæus refer to Matthew, when they represent the virgin birth as in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah 7. Justin (*Apology*, I:32; *Dialogue with Trypho*, I:59, 61, 76), Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* III:16[2], 19[2]), Tertullian (*De Carne Christi*, 19, 24), also find it in the Prologue of the Gospel of John (1[13]), which they read: ὃς οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθη, referring ὃς to Christ, and not to regenerate believers with the reading οἳ of the codices of the fourth and later centuries. The reading ὃς, two hundred years earlier than the earliest preserved Greek codices, within fifty years of the composition of the Gospel, contextually, naturally, rhetorically, and poetically the best reading, has been adopted by Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 234 *seq.*), Resch (*Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, IV: s. 57 *seq.*), and other critics; and is the best sustained, though not certain. Even with the plural οἳ Zahn maintains that by implication it refers to the virgin birth of Christ. In any case the author conceives of the entrance of the Logos into the world as a divine act, the becoming flesh as a voluntary act, and not depending on the will of a human father, which therefore is best explained by the virgin birth.

The story of the virgin birth in the Gospel of Luke (1[26-38]) was not original to the Gospel, but was derived by Luke from the canticle known as the *Ave Maria*, or *Hail Mary*, one of a series of poetic extracts used by Luke and trans-

lated by him from Hebrew originals, as the basis of his narrative of the infancy of Jesus. It belongs to the sources of Luke, just as truly as the Logia of Matthew and the original Mark; and therefore cannot be dated later than the outbreak of the Jewish war, in 66 A.D. Luke tells us, in the preface of his Gospel, that he had taken great pains to trace the course of all things from the first, to do it accurately, to write with orderly arrangement of the material, and to give only facts and truths that were certain. He shows by his Gospel and the Book of Acts that he used his sources conscientiously; and his general accuracy is unimpeached. He gives the genealogy of Jesus, depending for it upon records derived from the family of Jesus. If he consulted them with reference to the legal genealogy, it is altogether probable that he also consulted them with reference to the accuracy of the poetic statement of the virgin birth. The family of Jesus was represented by James the Just, the half-brother of our Lord, until his death († 60–62); and after his death by Simeon, his cousin († 107), both bishops of the Church; and one or both of these must be held responsible for the story of the virgin birth of our Lord. The testimony of such men is worthy of unqualified acceptance.

The story of the virgin birth in the Gospel of Matthew (1^{18-25}) is also based on an extract from a Hebrew poem, but a different one, written from the point of view of Joseph, rather than of Mary. The comment of Matthew is more elaborate than that of Luke; and, in accordance with his method of finding a fulfilment of prophecy in events in the life of Jesus, he regards the virgin birth as the fulfilment of Is. 7^{14}. This prophecy was not referred to in the original poem, has nothing whatever to do with the story as such, is not referred to by Luke, but is peculiar to Matthew and his methods (Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 318 *seq.*). We thus have two independent witnesses to the virgin birth, neither one depending on the other, both using older poetic sources, which they comment upon, after investigation, from different points of view. It is probable also that the Gospel

of John gives a third independent witness from a third point of view.

It seems at first remarkable that there is no reference to the virgin birth in the Gospel of Mark, the Epistles, and the Book of Acts; but that fact cannot be urged as an argument against the reality of the virgin birth, especially as an excellent reason may be given for their silence. It was necessary during the lifetime of the Virgin to keep this doctrinal fact esoteric for the chiefs of the Christian community, in order that she should not be exposed to such blasphemous slanders as did arise so soon as the virgin birth became a public doctrine. It was said that the father of Jesus was a soldier named Pantherus (*v.* Origen, *c. Celsum*, 28). But it is evident that Pantherus or Pandera is only a transliteration of פנדרא, itself formed from the Greek *παρθένος*, *virgin*, and is therefore in itself an indirect evidence that Jesus was the Virgin's son.

The earliest Gospel, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the apostolic preaching recorded in the Book of Acts, all represent this period of discreet silence.

But, in fact, all of these writings, in their emphasis upon the pre-existence and the divinity of Jesus Christ, and their statements as to special properties of the human nature of Christ, imply that the entrance of the Son of God into the world was a divine entrance and not an ordinary one with a human father.

The Gospel of Mark gives nothing whatever as to the life of Jesus prior to His baptism. And yet Mark was a native of Jerusalem. The early Christians were accustomed to meet at his mother's house (Acts 12^{12}). He was intimately acquainted with St. Peter, and knew personally the Virgin and the half-brothers of our Lord. It is improbable that he was ignorant of the virgin birth when he wrote his Gospel. He does not mention it for prudential reasons. These may account for his omission of everything relating to the early life of Jesus. But Mark does, in fact, at the very beginning of his Gospel assert the divinity of Christ; for he represents

that John the Baptist, His herald, was fulfilling the predictions of Isaiah and Malachi as to the advent of Yahweh, and so identifies the Son of God with Yahweh.

St. Paul in his Epistles teaches the pre-existence of Christ and His entrance into the world from the point of view of His pre-existence, and therefore chiefly on the divine side. He represents that Christ was *born of a woman*, but qualifies this by *sent forth by God the Father* (Gal. $4^{4,5}$); that He was *born of the seed of David according to the flesh*, but also *declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead* (Rom. $1^{3,4}$). St. Paul also represents that Jesus was the second Adam, differing from the first Adam in several important particulars, as having: (1) *a life-giving spirit*, πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (I Cor. 15^{45}); (2) *a spirit of holiness*, πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης (Rom. 1^{4}); (3) *the likeness of sinful flesh*, with the implication of *sinless flesh* (Rom. 8^{3}); (4) as *bringing life and incorruption to light*, ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν (II Tim. 1^{10}).

Thus St. Paul, while he lays stress upon the real humanity of Christ as Son of David and of Abraham, yet at the same time makes an antithesis between Him as the second Adam and the first Adam and all his race, not only in that he regards Him as a pre-existing divine being before His entrance into the world, but also in that he represents Him in the world as a man indeed, yet entirely separate from the inheritance of sin and death which all other men share from the first Adam, and as possessed of unique qualities such as constitute Him the head of redeemed humanity, namely: *sinless, incorruptible flesh*, and *a life-giving spirit of holiness*. These qualities could not have been derived from human ancestry. He could not have failed to inherit the sinfulness, corruption, and death of the first Adam, just as truly as all other men, if He had been born in the ordinary way of a human father, according to the teaching of St. Paul (Rom. 5–7). If St. Paul knew not the virgin birth of our Lord, he was quite near to it—so near in the implications of his teaching that no one has ever been able to suggest as a substitution for it

anything that would not undermine and destroy his entire theology.

The only ancient heretics who denied the virgin birth were the Ebionites and the Gnostics. They were not troubled about miracles or theophanies. These troubles are altogether modern. If the anti-Christian writers of the second and third centuries denied the virgin birth of our Lord, it was not that they regarded it as unscientific, or unphilosophical, or impossible, but because they had other Christological theories to maintain. Hence, so soon as these heretics were overcome, the virgin birth of our Lord remained undisputed as a cardinal doctrine of the Church until quite recent times. Indeed, it is easy to show that modern objections do not really arise from scientific or philosophical reasons, but are just as truly speculative as those of the ancient heretics. Modern forms of Ebionitism and Gnosticism are no more respectable than the ancient forms.

It is necessary, in order to understand the virgin birth of our Lord, to look at it from the divine side. It was not the birth of a man to whom God subsequently united Himself (that is what Gnosticism contended for): it was the entrance of God into the world in the way of birth from a virgin. It is *a priori* probable that, if God were to become man in the womb of a woman, He would become man, not in an ordinary human way, but in an extraordinary divine way, appropriate to the nature and character of the divine Being. There is something more than the processes of conception and childbirth in this case; there was a divine presence and a divine activity in the production of the humanity. As Justin says: "not of the seed of man, but of the will of God." * Inductive Science can say nothing here, because the fact is unique beyond its knowledge and testing. It is a question of fact, depending upon evidence which is sufficient and abundant, such as no one can reasonably refuse.

That which influences the objectors is not anything that science has to offer. The very ablest scientists hold to the

* *Apology*, I: 32.

virgin birth, not as scientists but as Christians. St. Luke, who is especially responsible for the doctrine, was the beloved physician of St. Paul; and doubtless knew all concerning the processes of generation and childbirth that was known to Hippocrates, and Aristotle, and the best medical and scientific writers of the time. Our moderns know more of science and medicine than he did, but St. Luke knew as much as they do of the biological processes with which this doctrine has to do. If he found no difficulty, why should they? The only difference that at all affects this question is that Luke accepted the presence and power of God in nature and human affairs, and therefore the supernatural and the miraculous; while modern objectors are agnostics, or sceptics, in this regard. We may fairly ask them to state their objections honestly from the standpoint of agnosticism, and not hide their agnosticism behind scientific and critical pretences.

The Incarnation, and indeed by virgin birth, was the initial saving act of the Son of God, upon which the whole process of salvation depends. As the first Adam summed up in himself all his descendants, the whole human race, who share with their first father the consequences of sin (Rom. 5), just so Jesus Christ recapitulates in Himself this same human race in order to redeem it. Jesus was more than an individual man. If He had been no more than that, His incarnation could not have had redemptive significance. God did not take to Himself a man, Jesus, born of Mary, as the ancient Gnostics held, and their modern representatives among the Ritschlians now hold. This would give only a divinely inhabited man, not a God-man. This would make Jesus nothing more than John the Baptist, who was just such a divinely inhabited man, "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1^{15}). It was God the Son, the second Person of the Trinity, the pre-existent Son of God, who became man by entering the Virgin's womb, being conceived by her and being born of her. God, by this conception and birth, took to Himself

human nature in its entireness, completeness, and integrity; yet He became thereby not merely such an individual man as John the Baptist; but, to use the term of the older theologians, a *common* man in whom all men have a share, a man who sums up in Himself all that is characteristic of perfect humanity. Jesus Christ did not share in the inheritance of sin and guilt, otherwise He Himself would have needed salvation. He made, as it were, a new beginning in humanity, taking to Himself the old humanity without its inheritance of evil, and introducing into humanity a spirit of holiness, incorruptible flesh, and an innocent sinlessness, in original, uninterrupted communion with the Father. This involves the perfection of humanity. It is just because God the Son thus identifies Himself, not with an individual man, but with humanity as such, that He is able to save the human race. In all His activities He acts as the second Adam, the Head of redeemed humanity. His incarnation united humanity to God and made human salvation realisable, because of the pulsations of the divine life in the humanity of Jesus Christ, and through Him in all who are united to Him in a regenerate life. St. Paul repeatedly represents that in all the saving acts of Christ all Christians are involved, because of their mystic union with Him as the second Adam, the God-man: so that His incarnation is in fact a regeneration of mankind. Just as there was in Adam the original birth of mankind, so all who are united to Christ by regeneration are crucified with Him, die with Him, are entombed with Him, rise from the dead in Him, are enthroned with Him, and their eternal salvation is assured in Him, the Incarnation having made all this union and communion possible, and actual, and eternal. What Christ began in humanity, in the Incarnation, and carried on step by step in His successive redemptive acts, He guarantees that He will eventually complete and perfectly accomplish.

The Christian faith as expressed in this article of the Creed embraces these elements:

(1) That Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost;

that is, that Mary conceived the Son of God not through human agency, but by the power of the Holy Spirit of God.

(2) Mary was before this conception, in the conception, and subsequent thereto in the birth of Jesus, a Virgin.

(3) By this conception and birth the Son of God received from the Virgin a complete human nature.

(4) The pre-existent Son of the Father was conceived and was born with the flesh and nature of man; and so God became the God-man, uniting humanity with deity in eternal union.

(5) The birth of the Virgin was the first act of salvation of the Son of the Father for the regeneration of mankind.

§ 8. *The fourth article of the Creed represents the death of Christ by crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, as the second great act of Christ for our salvation. He was entombed and His body preserved from corruption. This article was enlarged in its later forms to comprehend the sufferings that preceded the crucifixion, and to make explicit the death and the descent into Hades for the salvation of the dead.*

The Roman Creed of the fourth century has: τον ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα. The Creed of the second century was probably the same. But the later Creed was enlarged to *passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus;* and *descendit ad inferna* was added, sometimes affixed to this article, sometimes prefixed to the next article, sometimes as an independent article. Tertullian gives in his first form: *crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato,* in his second: *hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum, secundum scripturas,* in his third: *fixum cruci.* Irenæus gives in his first form: τὸ πάθος, in his second: *et passus sub Pontio Pilato.* Thus Irenæus follows the Eastern form, which is usually παθόντα, as Origen, Lucian, Eusebius, Arius, Epiphanius, the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan Creeds. The formula of exorcism of Justin (*Apol.* II:6; *Dial. Trypho,* 30, 85) confirms the form of the second century as *crucified under Pontius Pilate.*

(1) *Under Pontius Pilate.* There was especial reason for the mention of the Roman Governor in the Roman Creed, as indicating both the date of the crucifixion, and its execution by authority of the Roman Governor.

(2) *Crucified.* The specific term *crucified,* instead of the more general term *suffered,* was doubtless due to the influence of the Epistles of St. Paul upon the Roman community. The mode of death, by crucifixion, is an essential feature in St. Paul's theology.

St. Paul's teaching is that: (1) the crucifixion of Christ is the power of God unto salvation (I Cor. 1^{23-24}, 2^{2}; Gal. 6^{14}); (2) by it Christ became a curse for us, and redeemed us from the curse of the Law (Rom. 6^{6}; Gal. 2^{19-20}, 3^{13}; Col. 2^{14}); (3) by it Christ reconciled us to God (Eph. 2^{16}; Col. 1^{19-20}); (4) by it Christ completed His state of humiliation and earned His reward for us in His exaltation (Phil. 2^{8-11}). All these passages of St. Paul were well known to the Roman Church, and were undoubtedly used by them in interpreting this article of the Symbol.

We must bear in mind that the One who was crucified was not an ordinary man. If He had been such, even though a prophet and a hero, the greatest of all men, His crucifixion could not have had saving significance. He might have been an example of self-sacrifice and heroic devotion; but that could not have had any real value in effecting the salvation of mankind.

The Creed has already expressed the faith that He who was thus crucified was the Messiah of the Old Testament, the suffering, interposing Servant of Yahweh, of Is. 53, that He was the Son of the Father, Lord God. It is therefore belief in the crucifixion of a God-man that is professed in the Creed, and it is the union of God and man in the incarnation and birth from a Virgin's womb that gave the crucifixion a universal significance. It was the world crucifying the mediatorial Creator, Sovereign and Saviour, incarnate in human flesh. This supreme act of love in suffering crucifixion at the hands of the world, while it made the guilt

of the world supreme, yet showed the love of God in its supreme expression, triumphing over the supreme sin of the world. This is sublimely expressed in John's Gospel:

> "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3^{16}.)

Thenceforth the supreme sin became the deliberate rejection of the Saviour, as salvation is only by personal union with the Saviour; and it is doubtful, to say the least, whether any other sin will incur the supreme penalty of everlasting death.

(3) *And buried.* Crucifixion ended in death, but not usually in burial. The dead bodies were left on the cross to birds of prey, or cast aside as carcasses for beasts of prey. Even when for some special reason the bodies were given over to friends, they were usually burned and only their ashes preserved. It was to comply with Jewish custom that the dead body of Jesus was taken down from the cross, and after suitable preparation placed in a rock tomb (Mt. 27^{57-60}; Mark 15^{42-46}; Luke 23^{50-56}; John 19^{38-42}).

Jesus was not buried in the ground, but entombed, as was the custom among the Jews and the early Christians in Rome and elsewhere. It was important to state in the Creed that the body of Jesus was placed in a tomb, in order to the resurrection that followed. The entombment was part of Christ's work of salvation; because, as St. Paul tells us, Christians are by vital union with Him entombed with Him, in order to resurrection with Him (Rom. 6^{3-4}; Col. 2^{12}).

(4) *Suffered.* This came into the Roman Creed, probably by assimilation, from the Nicene Creed and other Eastern Creeds. It was probably in Eastern forms of the Apostles' Creed in the second century (*v.* p. 88). It was meant to include all the sufferings of Christ prior to the crucifixion. The verb $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$ is not used by St. Paul for the sufferings of Christ; but it is characteristic of St. Peter (I Pet. $2^{21, 23}$, 3^{18}, 4^{1}), of St. Luke (Gospel 17^{25}, 22^{15}, $24^{26, 46}$; Acts

1^{3}, 3^{18}, 17^{13}), and of the Epistle to the Hebrews (2^{18}, 5^{8}, 9^{26}, 13^{12}). The noun *πάθημα* is used in I Pet. 1^{11}, 4^{13}, 5^{1}; Heb. $2^{9, 10}$; II Cor. 1^{5}; Phil. 3^{10}. The sufferings of Christ were shared by His people through their vital union with Him, and realised especially in the period of martyrdom (Mark $10^{35\text{-}45}$; II Cor. 1^{5}; Phil. 3^{10}; Col. 1^{24}).

(5) *Dead.* This insertion seems unnecessary, as death was implied in the crucifixion and burial; yet Ignatius, Origen, and even Tertullian use it, the last two without *crucifixion*, Ignatius with *crucifixion*, but without *burial*. It was probably inserted merely for completeness and fulness of statement.

Death is especially the term of the Gospel of John, in antithesis with life ($10^{11, 15, 17, 18}$, 12^{33}, 15^{13}; I John 3^{16}); though it is used as a general term with reference to the crucifixion of Christ throughout the New Testament. It is quite possible that when the practice of crucifixion had passed away, and long been forgotten, ignorant people did not understand what crucifixion meant; and that it became important to make it plain to them that Christ *died* by an explicit statement in the Creed.

(6) *Descended into hell.* This phrase appears in a creed first in the Creed of Aquileia (*c.* 390). But it is found in three synodical declarations: those of Sirmium, Nice, and Constantinople (359–360).

Sirmium: Καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε οἰκονομήσαντα· ὃν πυλωροὶ ᾅδου ἰδόντες ἔφριξαν.

Nice: Καὶ ταφέντα καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα· ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ ᾅδης ἐτρόμασε.

Constantinople: Καὶ ταφέντα καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατεληλυθότα· ὅν τινα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ᾅδης ἔπτηξεν.

The words of Sirmium, ὃν πυλωροὶ ᾅδου ἰδόντες ἔφριξαν, depend upon Job 38^{17}, through Athanasius (*fragm. in Luc.* X : 22; *or. c. Arian.* III : 57); and Cyril of Jerusalem, who makes the descent one of the necessary doctrines (*Catech.* IV : 11).*

Rufinus says (§ 18): "Sciendum sane est quod in Ecclesiae Romanae symbolo non habetur additum 'Descendit ad inferna'; sed neque in

* *Cf.* especially Swete, *Apostles' Creed*, pp. 56 *seq.* and Kattenbusch, *Apost. Symbol*, II, s. 895 *seq.*

Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo: vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod 'sepultus' dicitur."

Some modern scholars, who have been opposed to the doctrine of an intermediate state, have urged, on the basis of these words of Rufinus, that *hell*, *inferna*, and even *Hades* were only synonyms of the grave: but that is impossible in view of Biblical statements as to *Hades* and the views of the early Fathers. What Rufinus evidently means is that the descent into *Hades* was really implied in the term *entombed* of the Roman Creed; for it was the universal opinion in ancient times that when the body was entombed the spirit departed from it to Hades.

The Athanasian Creed (early fifth century) has this clause. It is in the Creeds of Venantius Fortunatus (*c.* 570 A. D.) and the fourth Council of Toledo (633).*

The most important passages of Scripture, on which the doctrine of the Creed is founded, are:

(1) Acts 2^{27}, where St. Peter quotes the sixteenth Psalm and applies it to Christ:

"Thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades;
Neither wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption." (R. V.)†

(2) Jesus also refers to Hades (Luke $16^{22\text{-}23}$, 23^{43}). Hades was the general name for the abode of the dead. It might be used for the whole or for a part. There were the two parts: *Abraham's bosom* or *Paradise*, the abode of the righteous, and the *Pit* or *Destruction*, the place of punishment.‡

* The Old Testament usage of שאול is given in my article on that word in the new *Robinson-Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon*, BDB; the New Testament usage of ᾅδης in Thayer's *Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*.

† The original is:

"Thou wilt not leave me to Sheol;
Thou wilt not suffer Thy pious one to see the Pit."

(*V.* Briggs, *Commentary on the Psalms, in loco.*)

Luke follows the LXX in making שחת abstract, rather than the concrete *Pit* of Sheol.

‡ שחת, כור, אברון, ἀπώλεια, γέεννα: *v.* Hebrew and Greek lexicons, especially my articles in new edition *Robinson-Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon*, BDB.

(3) St. Paul refers to the descent of Jesus to Hades (Eph. 4^{9-10}). Usage makes it evident that τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς refers to Hades, and indeed the deeper, gloomier regions of punishment* (Ezek. 26^{20}, $32^{18, 24}$; Psalms 63^{9}, 86^{13}, 88^{7}, 139^{15}); and this is the interpretation of most of the ancients and the best moderns. The captives were rescued from the enemy (*cf.* Psalms 68^{18}; Ju. 5^{12}), and brought with Him by Jesus in His ascent from Hades (*cf.* Mt. 27^{52-3}; John 5^{25}).

(4) The most important passage is I Pet. 3^{18-20}. The ancients were well-nigh unanimous in referring it to Christ's descent to Hades and His preaching to the antediluvians.†

Jesus' statement to the dying robber, and St. Peter's words on the day of Pentecost, imply that Jesus went to the paradise of Hades. St. Paul's statement implies that He went to Hades to rescue prisoners. St. Peter teaches that Jesus went to the prison of Hades to preach to the wicked antediluvians. If the Gospel was preached to them, then certainly to others less wicked than they, and certainly not in vain; especially as St. Paul tells us that He did rescue captives. It is also evident from Heb. 2^{14} *seq.*, Rev. 1^{18}, that Jesus has authority over Hades, and triumphed over death and Satan there. This is the background of the mission of Christ to the underworld. It was indeed just as important that Jesus should preach to the dead as to the living, if there is salvation in no other (Acts 4^{12}), and He is to be the Judge of the dead as well as the living.

There were different opinions among the ancients as to the work of Christ in Hades. The Creed undoubtedly means that Jesus Christ descended to Hades as an important part of His work of salvation; for all the acts mentioned in the Creed are saving acts. It meant to the early Christians certainly:

(1) That Christ thereby became the conqueror of Death, Hades, and the devil, and took all believers from under their authority and control.

(2) It also meant that He preached His Gospel to all the

* *V.* Briggs, *Comm. Pss., in loco; Messiah of Apostles*, p. 202.

† *V.* Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 56 *seq.*

pious dead of the old dispensation, who there believed on Him and shared in Christian salvation.

(3) It is uncertain how far the pious dead were removed from Hades to Heavèn in the resurrection of Jesus. The New Testament teaches that some of the pious dead, the saints and martyrs, accompanied Jesus in His resurrection (Mt. 27^{52-53}; Rev. 6^{9}); and that was the consensus of the early fathers of the Church (Ignatius, *Magn.* 9; Eusebius, *H. E.* I : 13^{19}; Justin, *Tryph.* 72; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* III: 20^{4}, IV : 27^{2}, V : $31^{1,2}$; Hippolytus, *de antichristo,* 26; Tertullian, *de anima,* 55), and of the Church itself until the present time.

The fathers and doctors of the Church generally ignore the question whether Christ preached to the wicked dead and saved any of them. The tendency of scholastic theologians was to draw the line of salvation strictly by sacramental tests, and limit salvation to those for whom it had been begun in this world by baptism, either in fact or through the baptism of desire; but they all recognised that for such the processes of salvation continued in Hades until they were completed. But the early fathers either represent that Christ preached to and saved some of the wicked dead, or else do not mention them at all.

Hermas (*Sim.* 9^{16}) says that the Apostles and teachers of the Church continued their work in Hades and baptised converts there. So Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VI : 6), and Origen (*c. Celsum,* II : 43), extend the preaching among the dead to the pious heathen. Hippolytus represents that John the Baptist heralded the advent of Christ in Hades as well as in Palestine (*de antichristo,* 45). This opinion is reasonable and probable, but not certain.

There are three modern interpretations of the descent of Christ into Hell that have no support in Scripture or in the ancient fathers: (1) that it means nothing more than descent into the grave; (2) that Christ suffered in hell the penalties of the damned; (3) that He descended to triumph over the devil in his own dominion.

None of these theories can explain the insertion of this clause in the Creed; and they are altogether inconsistent with the purpose of all the acts of Jesus mentioned in the Creed, which was salvation. The common ignoring of Hades altogether, among Protestants, as an intermediate state of salvation, and the opinion that all those who are to be saved at all immediately at death ascend to heaven, are altogether unscriptural, unhistorical, and unreasonable.

§ 9. *The fifth article of the Apostles' Creed represents the resurrection of Christ from among the dead, on the third day, as His third great act of salvation, securing thereby the resurrection of mankind and the justification of all believers.*

The fifth article of the Old Roman Creed was: *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν.*

The Creed of the fourth century was the same, except for the substitution of the indicative for the participle of the same verb: *tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.*

The Creed has always remained the same in this article since the second century.

The exact words of the Creed are not found in the New Testament, nor among the apostolic fathers.

Ignatius has: *ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν.*

Irenæus has in his first form: *τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν*; in his second form: *resurgens.*

Tertullian has in his first form: *tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis;* in his second form: *resuscitatum a Patre;* in his third form: *tertia die resurrexisse.*

The Creeds of Cyril, Eusebius, and Nicæa have: *ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.*

It seems probable from the usage of these Eastern Creeds, that underlying the Creed of the second century there was a still earlier form without *ἐκ νεκρῶν,* and that the original form of the Roman Creed was that of the Oriental Creeds, so far as this article is concerned.

The whole phrase in these early Creeds is primarily based

on the words of Jesus Himself, predicting His resurrection.*

The Lukan Gospel, here as elsewhere, was at the basis of the Roman Creed, the original being based on the words of Jesus, Luke 9^{22}, 18^{33}; later enlarged by the addition of ἐκ νεκρῶν from Luke 24^{46}.

(1) *On the third day.* This phrase was doubtless used because of its significance in the words of Jesus Himself, fulfilled as they were by the event, as represented in I Cor. 15. The significance of the third day was: (*a*) To make sufficiently evident the reality of the death, burial, and descent into Hades. There was sufficient time for all these. (*b*) To prevent an extension of the time during which the Redeemer would be subjected to Death and Hades. (*c*) To make the resurrection more distinct and definite as an event which happened at a particular time and after a predicted interval. Doubtless the prediction of Jesus and its fulfilment were in the minds of the authors of the Creed.

(2) ἀναστάντα, *risen.* This aorist participle is connected, as all the other terms, with *Jesus Christ, God's Son, our Lord.* The verb is here *active*, as implying that the resurrection was an act of the Lord Himself.

St. Luke (9^{22}, 18^{33}, 24^{46}) follows Mark (8^{31}, 9^{31}, 10^{34}) in regarding the Son as active in the resurrection, quoting in all cases words of Jesus, and using ἀνίστημι (intransitive), *rise up, stand up,* doubtless because of the Aramaic of Jesus and the Hebrew of Mark.† Luke in Acts usually has ἀνίστημι, but uses also ἐγείρω (10^{40} +). Matthew (16^{21}, 17^{23}, 20^{19}) agrees with St. Paul in using ἐγείρω, *arouse from the sleep of death* = הקיץ, the Old Testament term of Is. 26^{19}, Dan. 12^{2}. In the Gospel of John, so far as the resurrection comes into view, the Son is active. He has life in Himself as the Father hath. Usually the resurrection is combined with the ascension, in the return to the Father and the ascending to where He was before.

* Mark 8^{31} = Mt. 16^{21} = Luke 9^{22}; Mark 9^{31} = Mt. 17^{23}; Mark 10^{34} = Mt. 20^{19} = Luke 18^{33}; Luke 24^{46}.

† Delitzsch, *Hebrew New Testament,* uses קום here.

St. Paul regards the resurrection of Christ as the cardinal principle of his theology. "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain" (I Cor. 15^{14}).

The same is true also of St. Peter and the other early Christian preachers. The apostles were especially *witnesses of Christ's resurrection.* That was an essential requisite for the choice of the one who was to supply the place of Judas in the college of the Twelve (Acts 1^{22}).

The original story of the resurrection of Jesus has not been preserved in the existing text of Mark; and therefore we cannot be sure how far Luke and Matthew depend upon it. Mark gives four predictions of the resurrection by our Lord Himself (8^{31}, $9^{9, 31}$, 10^{34}), which imply their fulfilment in the narrative. It is probable, however, that the reports of Luke and Matthew, as well as those in the Appendix to Mark, are based upon Mark's original. There are eleven appearances of Jesus after His resurrection. Three are common to St. Paul and the Synoptists: (*a*) to St. Peter (I Cor. 15^{5}; Luke 24^{34}); (*b*) to the eleven (I Cor. 15^{5}; Mark 16^{14}; John 20^{26-29}; Acts 1^{1-5}); (*c*) to all the apostles (I Cor. 15^{7}; Mark 16^{19}; Luke 24^{50-51}; Acts 1^{6-11}). Three are peculiar to St. Paul: (*d*) to the five hundred; (*e*) to St. James; (*f*) to St. Paul himself (I Cor. 15^{6-8}). Four are given only in the Synoptic Gospels: (*g*) to the Magdalene and other women (Mark 16^{9-11}; Mt. 28^{9-10}; John 20^{11-18}); (*h*) to the two disciples at Emmaus (Mark 16^{12-13}; Luke 24^{13-23}); (*i*) to the Ten in the upper chamber (Luke 24^{36-43}; John 20^{19-24}); (*j*) to the Eleven on a mountain in Galilee (Mt. 28^{16-17}; Mark 16^{15-18}). The Appendix to John gives an additional one (John 21^{1-23}).* Jesus appeared to St. Paul once on the way to Damascus (Acts 9^{1-19}, 22^{5-16}, 26^{10-18}; *cf.* Gal. $1^{1, 15-16}$; I Cor. 9^{1}; II Cor. 11^{5}, $12^{11, 12}$), once to an aggregate of 500 disciples, to the Eleven at least thrice, to ten of them at least four times, to seven of them at least five times, and to St. Peter no less than six times, besides the theophanies

* *V.* Briggs, *New Light on the Life of Jesus,* pp. 110 *seq.*

to St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John reported elsewhere in the New Testament (Acts 10^{9-16}, 22^{18-21}, 23^{11}; II Cor. 12^{1-4}; Rev.1^{9} *seq.* +). Thus the evidence for the resurrection is varied, cumulative, and consistent, and all that could reasonably be expected.

(3) *ἐκ νεκρῶν, from the dead.* This term was derived from Luke 24^{46}. It was probably not in the earliest Creeds. It is, however, usually attached to the resurrection in the New Testament, and so would naturally come into the Creed. Νεκροί, m. pl.= *dead persons*, those who have died, and whose spirits are in Hades. The statement therefore is that Jesus rose from among the dead, from the realm of the dead, His Spirit from Hades, His body from the tomb.

The resurrection, as the third great act of salvation, is attached by St. Paul to the act of justification: "He was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification" (Rom. 4^{25}).

§ 10. *The sixth article of the Creed presents the ascension of the Son of the Father into heaven, as His fourth act of salvation, securing to His people likewise access to the Father in heaven through Him, during their earthly life in prayer and communion, eventually in reality of personal presence.*

The sixth article of the Creed is: *ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς*. This has remained essentially the same, only the Latin and modern translations substitute the indicative for the participle.

Ignatius has: *ἀνελήφθη πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*; the verb as in Mark 16^{19}; I Tim. 3^{16}; *cf.* Acts 1^{11}; the *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* a paraphrase of the return to the Father of John's Gospel.

Irenæus, in his first form, has: *τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀλάλητιν τοῦ ἠγαπημένου* Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ etc.; in his second form: *et in claritate receptus.*

Tertullian varies his verb, in the first form *receptum*, in the second *resumptum*, in the third *ereptum*, in all *into heaven.* The Nicene and other Eastern Creeds use *ἀνελθόντα* with either *into heaven* or *unto the Father.*

The ascension intervenes between the resurrection and the session at the right hand of the Father, and in itself is involved in these two redemptive acts of Christ. It is implied, sometimes in the resurrection, sometimes in the session, the former usually in St. Paul's Epistles. Indeed, the resurrection implies the ascent from Hades and the ascent to heaven; and so the whole may be considered as a resurrection, and often is by St. Paul (*cf.* Eph. 1^{20}). If the ascension is seldom mentioned in the New Testament, it is implied, both in the resurrection and in the session. Indeed, there could be no session at the right hand of God without the enthronement, which is itself the goal of the ascension. The ascension is specifically mentioned in Mark 16^{19}; Luke 24^{51}; Acts $1^{2, 9-11}$, and foretold in John 6^{62}, 20^{17}.

All the passages which report Christ as coming from heaven in a second Advent imply the ascension to heaven. The ascent is frequently implied in the Pauline Epistles, though seldom stated (*cf.* Eph. 4^{8-10}; possibly I Tim. 3^{16}).

St. Peter says: "Him did God exalt at His right hand (to be) a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins" (Acts 5^{31}).

Revelation 5 gives the scene: the ascending Lord appearing in heaven before the throne, and welcomed with the worship of all heaven and the new song.

The ascension of Christ begins the reign of Christ over His Messianic kingdom. Upon that ascension depends the advent of the divine Spirit at Pentecost, which may be regarded as His coronation gift to His kingdom. It is just because Jesus Christ is the second Adam, incorporating a new humanity in Himself, that His ascension is their ascension, giving them a sure title to their heavenly inheritance.*

§ 11. *The seventh article of the Creed represents the session at the right hand of the Father, as the fifth redemptive act of the Son of God. He there reigns as Prophet, Priest, and King, over the Church and the universe. His people share in all the ben-*

* *Cf.* Eph. 1^{3}, 2^{4} *seq.*; Col. 3^{1-3}; I Pet. 1^{3-5}.

efits of His reign, and in its service in the use of the talents committed to them.

The seventh article of the Creed of the second and fourth centuries was: *καὶ καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρός, sedet ad dexteram Patris.*

Irenæus does not give this clause, but combines it with the previous one. Tertullian, in his three forms, has essentially the same phrase, varying only in forms of the same verb: *sedentem, sedere, sedisse.*

The original Nicene Creed, like the Creed of Eusebius, has it not; but the Constantinopolitan has it. The received form of the Apostles' Creed has been enlarged so as to be: *Sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.* It is evident that *God the Father Almighty* has simply been taken over from article I, and has exactly the same force and meaning here as there.

The Biblical passages at the back of this article of the Creed are the words of Jesus (Mt. 26^{64}, 28^{18}; Mark 14^{62}, 16^{19}; Luke 22^{69}). St. Paul is especially rich in references to the Messianic reign (I Cor. 15^{25}; Phil. $2^{9\text{-}11}$; Eph. $1^{20\text{-}23}$; Col. 3^{1}; *cf.* Heb. $1^{3\text{-}4}$, 7^{26}, 8^{1}, $12^{22\text{-}29}$).

It is probable that the earliest form in the Apostles' Creed was, *at the right hand of God,* as usual in the New Testament. The change to *the right hand of the Father* was probably made to assimilate this article to the first and second articles of the Creed.

(1) *The right hand of the Father* was the place of highest honour and rank, the place of the Crown Prince, to whom all authority has been given, the place next to that of the Father. (2) The *sitting* is in the pregnant sense of *sitting enthroned,* in accordance with the usage of the Messianic Psalms 2 and 110. The doctrine is that Christ is enthroned with supreme dominion over heaven, earth, and hades. He reigns as Prophet, Priest, and King. As Prophet, He sends the divine Spirit to be the teacher, counsellor, and guide of the Church. As King He is the head of the Church as the kingdom of redemption, subduing all enemies and sav-

ing His people. As Priest He offers up perpetual sacrifice and sums up the universal worship, interceding and interposing for His people. The capital of the kingdom of God is with Christ in heaven, where the New Jerusalem takes the place of the old, with all its sacred typical institutions, which are now centred and summed up in Christ.

St. Paul, especially in the Epistles of the Imprisonment, lays great stress upon the reign of Christ (Eph. 4^{10-13}, 5^{25-27}; Phil. 3^{20}; Col. 2^{3}). The reign of Christ is also the reign of His Church, which is regnant on the earth (Rev. 5^{9-10}, 20^{4}). According to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ is at once the great High Priest, and the one great eternal sacrifice, once offered, but of eternal validity with the Father, and to His people on earth through their fellowship with Him in His priesthood and sacrifice (*cf.* I Tim. 2^{5-6}).

Because of the unity of Christ with His people the Church is His body, and shares with Him in His conquest of the world and His subjugation of all enemies.

§ 12. *The eighth article of the Creed represents the second advent of Christ as His sixth and final redemptive act. This advent is in order to a judgment of final salvation to His people, and of final condemnation to all others.*

The Creed of the fourth century was: *inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos.* The Creed of the second century seems to have been the same. This article has remained unchanged from the beginning.

Irenæus enlarges upon this theme. His first form has: *And His Parousia from heaven in the glory of the Father to comprehend all things under one head.* His second form has: *Shall come in glory, the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Judge of those who are judged; and sending into eternal fire the perverters of the truth and the despisers of His Father and His Advent.*

Tertullian has in his first and second forms: *Venturum judicare vivos et mortuos;* in his third form: *Venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitae æternae et promissorum*

cœlestium fructum, et ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo.

There are two items in this article: (1) *the coming,* and (2) the purpose of it, *judgment;* both common New Testament ideas.

(1) *The Coming.* There are several New Testament terms for this: (*a*) *παρουσία, presence, advent* (Mt. 24^{3} *seq.;* I Thes. 2^{19}, 3^{13}, 4^{15}, 5^{23}; II Thes. $2^{1,8}$; I Cor. 15^{23}; Jas. $5^{7,8}$; II Pet. 1^{16}, 3^{4}); the second presence of Christ, being in antithesis with His first presence. (*b*) *ἀποκάλυψις, revelation* (II Thes. 1^{7}; I Cor. 1^{7}; I Pet. $1^{7,13}$, 4^{13}). (*c*) *ἐπιφάνεια, epiphany, appearance,* used in the Pastorals (I Tim. 6^{14}; II Tim. 1^{10}, $4^{1,8}$; Titus 2^{13}).

None of these technical terms of the New Testament are used in the Creed, but only the simple one, *comes, coming, ἔρχεται, ἐρχόμενον.* This is to be explained from the watchword of the early Christians: *Our Lord cometh.* The Aramaic form of this, מרנא אתה = *μαρὰν ἀθά,* is preserved in I Cor. 16^{22}. Varied forms of *ἔρχομαι* are used in the Greek text by Jesus Himself and His apostles for the Second Advent. Thus Jesus Himself predicts His own advent: *When He cometh in the glory of Himself and of the Father and of the holy angels* (Luke 9^{26}); and again: *And then shall they see the Son of Man coming on a cloud with power and great glory.**

Undoubtedly the early Christians expected the speedy advent of the Lord, and in times of persecution ardently longed for it. So Christians in all ages, at some times more than others, have looked and prayed for the return of Christ in the spirit of Rev. 22^{20}.

(2) *The judgment.* *Κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς* is common to all the Creeds, and is based on Acts 10^{42}; II Tim. 4^{1}; I Pet. 4^{5}. The purpose of the Second Advent is judgment in the comprehensive sense; a judgment of all mankind, justifying and rewarding the righteous, condemning and punishing the wicked. Both the living and the dead are to be judged.

* Luke 21^{27} (*cf.* also Mt. 10^{23}, 16^{27}, 25^{31}; Mark 8^{38}; Luke 23^{42}; Acts 1^{11}; I Cor. 4^{5}, 11^{26}; I Thes. 5^{2}; II Thes. 1^{10}).

This is in accord with the doctrine of the Descent into Hades to preach the Gospel to the dead and to save the dead. All alike are to have the offer of the Gospel; all alike are to be judged by the Gospel.

§ 13. *The ninth article of the Creed, the first of the third trinitarian section, expresses faith in the Holy Spirit as the third Person of the Holy Trinity.*

The received form of this article is: *I believe in the Holy Spirit—Credo in Spiritum Sanctum.* The Creed of the fourth century, and so also the primitive form of the Creed, was without the *Credo;* and connected this article, as all the previous ones, with the *credo* of the first article by the conjunction *and,* as did Irenæus, Rufinus, Marcellus, and others in the West, the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds in the East, and the Creeds of Eusebius and Epiphanius, upon which they depend.

The Holy Spirit is given in the third original article of the Creed as the third Person of the Trinity of the baptismal formula. The doctrine of the Divine Spirit pervades the Bible. In the Old Testament the divine Spirit is *the energy, the active power of God:* (1) as a spirit stimulating the prophets and directing them in their teaching (Hos. 9^{7}; Zech. 7^{12}; Is. 48^{16}); (2) as a power taking effective part in the creation of the world (Gen. 1^{2}), in theophanies (Ezek. 1^{12}, 10^{17}), and in transformations of nature (Is. 32^{15}); (3) as an ethical influence in the moral development of Israel (Is. 30^{1}, $63^{9\text{-}14}$) and of individuals (Psalms 51^{13}, 143^{10}; Prov. 1^{23}).*

These same characteristics appear in the New Testament with more emphasis and a more extensive working: (1) The divine Spirit is the power in the virgin birth of our Lord (*v.* p. 52). (2) The divine Spirit descends in the form of a dove upon Jesus at His baptism (Mark $1^{10\text{-}11}$; *cf.* Is. 11^{1} *seq.*). (3) The divine Spirit descends in theophany on the day of Pentecost, and takes possession of the disciples of

* *V.* Briggs, *Use of* רוח *in the Old Testament, Journ. Bib. Lit.* XIX, and *Hebrew Lexicon* BDB, *sub voce.*

Jesus in accordance with His promises (Acts 2^{1-4}) and also of Samaritan and Gentile converts at a later time (Acts 8^{15-20}, 10^{44-47}, 11^{15-17}, 15^{8-9}, 19^{2-6}). (4) The divine Spirit inhabits the Church and the Christian (I Cor. 3^{16}, 6^{19}; Rom. 8^{16}; Eph. 2^{18-22}). (5) The Holy Spirit is the active agent of regeneration in connection with baptism (John 3^{5-8}). (6) The Holy Spirit distributes the charisms of Christian service (I Cor. 12^{4-13}). (7) The Holy Spirit is the intellectual and moral guide of believers (Mark 13^{11}; John 7^{37-39}, 14^{26}; Acts 1^{4-8}; Gal. $5^{16-18, 25}$; I Thes. 4^{7-8}; Rom. 8^{2}). (8) The Holy Spirit is the third person of the Trinity of God: (*a*) The Father and the Son will come in the Spirit and abide in the faithful (John 14^{10-23}). (*b*) He proceedeth from the Father, and is sent by the Son (John 15^{26}). (*c*) He is distinguished at the baptism of Jesus as a third with Father and Son. (*d*) He is joined with Father and Son in the name of the baptismal formula (Mt. 28^{19}). (*e*) The Three are associated in the work of redemption (I Pet. 1^{2}). (*f*) with the same charisms (I Cor. 12^{4-13}). (*g*) in the benediction (II Cor. 13^{14}). (*h*) His personality seems to be taught (Rom. 8^{26-27}; Eph. 2^{18-22}, $4^{3-6, 30}$). Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* I : 10^{1}, IV : 33^{7}) and Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 2; *Præscrip. Hær.* 13) teach the divinity and personality of the Spirit and His activity as the source of inspiration of the prophets, the intellectual and moral guide of the Church and Christians, the agent of regeneration, the Paraclete, and the ever-present and indwelling Spirit of the Church and the individual Christian.

The Creed limited itself at first to the statement of the divinity, personality, and holiness of the Spirit; then it added the three chief saving works of the Holy Spirit in three following articles, just as the six saving acts of Christ were added to the second article, probably about the same time.

§ 14. *The tenth article of the Creed, and the first of the articles on the work of the Holy Spirit, expresses faith in the*

Church as Holy, having the same attribute as the Holy Spirit, who originates and inhabits it. In later forms of the Creed the attributes of Catholic and Apostolic were added, and the Communion of Saints.

The received form of this article is: *sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem.* The Creed of the fourth century had *sanctam ecclesiam,* and this was without doubt the original in the old Roman Creed.

Cyril's Creed of Jerusalem has: *one holy catholic Church;* the Creed of Epiphanius and the Constantinopolitan: *one holy catholic and apostolic Church.*

(1) *Church, ecclesia,* ἐκκλησία, is a term of the New Testament, used for a local congregation and also for the whole body of Christians. The latter sense is that of the Creed. The Church embraces all who have been baptised into union with Christ. The Church as the body of Christ is only *one,* and can only be one. This was implied in the name *church.* Later, when syncretic religious organisations were established as rivals of the Church, the term *one* was added, as in the Creed of Jerusalem and the Constantinopolitan, to emphasise the *unity* of the Church. The division of the Church into separate and independent, and even conflicting jurisdictions impairs the unity of the Church, but cannot destroy the vital unity of faith in Christ or the organic unity effected by baptism into the name of the holy Trinity.

(2) ἅγιος, *holy,* is applied to the Church, as the plural, ἅγιοι, to Christians, in the sense not of perfection but of *consecration,* as sacred, hallowed. This consecration of the Church was made on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came upon the assembled disciples of Jesus and took possession of them, in order to inhabit them as a sacred temple (*cf.* Eph. $2^{19\text{-}22}$).

(3) The term *catholic* is not a New Testament term, but seems, like *church,* to have originated in Antioch. It is used, however, by the early Fathers,* for the Church throughout

* Ignatius, *Ep. Smyr.* 1, 8; *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* 1, 8, 19; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I : 10^3.

the world, the *universal* Church. The term did not get into the Roman creed until after the fourth century, probably owing to Eastern influence; but it was implied from the beginning in the term *Church* as used in the New Testament and the Fathers.

(4) *Apostolic.* This term is also implied in the meaning of Church; for the Church can be no other than that body which was organised and trained by the apostles of Jesus Christ, and which has unbroken apostolic succession. The term came into the Creed through Eastern influence, in order to exclude from the Church the more distinctly everything that departed from the apostolic foundations. *Apostolic* was used primarily of doctrine, and only secondarily of institution (*cf.* Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* III: 2^2).

(5) *Communion of saints.* This term came into the Creed probably through the influence of Niceta, from whom it passed over into the Gallican Creeds. This clause is the enlargement of the idea of the unity of the Church, rather than of the diversity of privileges contained in it. The usage of the New Testament favours the meaning of *share in, participation in the saints.* This is also the interpretation of Niceta, who gives the earliest form of the Creed that uses it.

"What is the Church but the congregation of all saints? Patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, all the just who have been, are, or shall be, are one Church, because, sanctified by one faith and life, marked by One Spirit, they constitute one body. Believe, then, that in this one Church you will attain the communion of saints." *

This interpretation has come down by overwhelming tradition as the correct one. It is furthermore favoured by the fact that it is an additional predicate of the Church, as a Church in which there is a communion of saints.

§ 15. *The eleventh article of the Creed teaches the doctrine of remission of sins in connection with the Holy Spirit and*

* *V.* Caspari, *Anecdota,* I, pp. 355 *seq.*

baptism, which unite the individual with the Church, and give him a share in all its benefits.

The eleventh article of the Creed is simply *remission of sins, remissionem peccatorum.* This article has remained unchanged from the beginning.

This phrase is absent from the forms of Irenæus and Tertullian, but is given by Cyprian and the Eastern Creeds. The longer Creed of Jerusalem has *in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;* the Constantinopolitan *in one baptism for the remission of sins.* The connection of the remission of sins with repentance and baptism is based on the Gospels (Mark 1^{4}; Luke 1^{77}, 3^{3}, $24^{46\text{-}47}$; Mt. 26^{28}), and the Book of Acts (2^{38}, 5^{31}, 10^{43}). The term *remission of sins* is only used twice by St. Paul (Eph. 1^{7}; Col. 1^{14}); because he usually emphasises the positive side of salvation by justification. The two are combined, however, in his preaching, according to Acts $13^{38\text{-}39}$. The connection of remission of sins with baptism makes it appropriate as a subordinate article to that of the Holy Spirit.

(1) *Remission of sins* was a doctrine of the Old Testament, expressed in the term נשא, with its synonyms סלח and העביר; literally, *to take away, remove.* The New Testament equivalent is *ἀφίημι, to send away, remit.* The fundamental idea is the removal of sins away from the divine presence, so that they may no longer obstruct union and communion with God. The English equivalent is usually *forgiveness,* like the German *vergeben,* and the French *pardonner, pardon;* literally, *give away.* This is the earliest, simplest, and most pervasive conception of the getting rid of sin, and therefore it appears with propriety in the baptismal Creed.

(2) *Repentance* is involved with the remission of sins as its indispensable condition, as is evident from the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of the apostles. The New Testament term is *μετάνοια, change of mind,* corresponding with the Old Testament שוב, *turn about, return.* Such a change of mind has its positive and its negative sides. It involves a turning away from sin and a turning unto God.

The ceremony of baptism represents this change. It is a bath of regeneration, a death to the old life of sin, a rebirth, or resurrection, into the new life of the divine Spirit.

(3) The *Holy Spirit* is the agent of this regeneration, which alone makes repentance effective and secures the remission of sins. The repenting sinner is by the divine Spirit regenerated, and raised from the death of sin into the life which he henceforth lives under the guidance of the Spirit, who dwells within him, leads him, and gradually transforms him.

§ 16. *The last article of the Creed teaches the resurrection of the body of the Christian at the second advent of the Lord, by the power of the Holy Spirit, and implies an eternal life, in the body as well as in the spirit, with Christ and His Church. Subsequently this was made explicit by the addition of the phrase: Life Eternal.*

The received form of the Creed has: *resurrection of the flesh, life eternal.* The Creed of the fourth century had only *carnis resurrectionem.* The early Roman Creed had *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.*

The phrase is not a New Testament phrase. We have rather: *ἀνάστασις (τῶν) νεκρῶν* (Mt. 22^{31}; Acts 17^{32}, 23^{6}, 24^{21}, 26^{23}; I Cor. 15^{12} *seq.*, $^{21, 42}$; Heb. 6^{2}; *cf.* Acts 24^{15}). So the Constantinopolitan Creed has *νεκρῶν* without the article.

But it is quite evident that *σαρκός, carnis*, had come into usage in the Creed; for that phrase is familiar to Irenæus, Tertullian, Justin, and others. Thus Irenæus (*Adv. Hær* I : 10^{1}): *To raise up all flesh of all mankind;* Tertullian: *per carnis etiam resurrectionem* (*de virg. vel.* 1); *cum carnis restitutione* (*de præs. hær.* 13).

Cyril has in his longer form: *εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.*

The motive for the change was to make it impossible to think only of the resurrection of a disembodied spirit, and to show that the resurrection was of the whole man, body and soul.

It is altogether probable that *σάρξ, flesh*, came into the

Creed from Psalm 16[9], quoted by St. Peter, Acts 2[26-27,31], where it certainly means *body*, and not the *flesh* of the body. בשר in the Old Testament and its equivalent σάρξ in the New Testament sometimes mean the flesh of the body; but they commonly have the meaning of *body*, as in the passages given above.*

There can be no doubt that the meaning in the Creed is *body*, and not *flesh* of the body. St. Paul uses σῶμα of the body of the resurrection in I Cor. 15, and on that account gives σάρξ the more specific sense of the fleshly substance of the body. He there affirms that the resurrection body will not have the flesh and blood characteristic of the earthly body, corruptible and mortal; but will be heavenly, incorruptible, immortal, and glorious like the body of Christ, composed of a heavenly substance, into which it has been transubstantiated. The attempt to show a contradiction between St. Paul and the Creed in the doctrine of the Resurrection ignores the usage of the terms for *flesh* in the Old and New Testaments, and especially that of the passage upon which the doctrine is founded.

Opinions as to the nature of the body of the resurrection have varied in the Church; and such variations are permissible, so long as they recognise the reality of the body.

Eternal life was added to the Creed, probably through the influence of the Creed of Niceta and the longer Creed of Jerusalem. This eternal life is that which follows the resurrection of the body and the ultimate judgment; to be distinguished from the eternal life, which begins, according to the Gospel of John, with the new birth in this world, or from that which begins immediately after death in the intermediate state of Hades.

The Apostles' Creed is based on the New Testament, especially upon the Teaching of Jesus and His Apostles as recorded in the Gospels and Book of Acts; and to a great extent is *Lukan*, as would naturally be the case in the prim-

* *V.* Briggs, *Comm. Psalms*, I, p. 126.

itive Roman Creed, which is the basis of that form of the Creed which has prevailed until the present time. The several articles of the Creed have had varied interpretation from time to time in detail, in logical deduction, and through changes in the usage of technical terms; but these variations have never affected the substance and essential meaning of the Creed. The ancient interpretations of some of the articles were too gross for acceptance in modern times: but gross interpretations do not impair the essential meanings of a Creed; they err by exaggeration. Such exaggerations do not justify the other extreme of minimising the Creed, which destroys its essential Biblical and historical meaning. The Biblical meaning of the Creed has always been maintained by the Church throughout history until the present day, and we may safely say that it always will be maintained.

CHAPTER III

THE NICENE CREED

§ 1. *The Nicene Creed has three forms:* (1) *The original Nicene Creed, prepared by the Council of Nice in* 325; (2) *the official Eastern form, approved by the Council of Constantinople in* 381, *and finally adopted by the Council of Chalcedon in* 451; (3) *the official Western form, finally adopted by Rome in the ninth century.*

The Apostles' Creed set forth in simple, graphic language the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, and the saving acts of the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. The Creed received various modifications in the different local churches, East and West, to rule out various heresies, such as the Gnostic and Docetic syncretisms and the various forms of Monarchianism. Monarchianism still persisted, and by misinterpretation of the Creed managed to evade it. The Monarchians insisted on the unity and monarchy of God and the subordination of Christ and the Holy Spirit, teaching a *modal* or a *dynamic* Trinity. The chief representative of modalism in the third century was Sabellius, condemned by Pope Calixtus in 220; the chief representative of the dynamic theory was Paul of Samosata, condemned at Antioch by three provincial councils, and deposed at the last one in 269.

The Modalist preserved the divinity of Christ at the expense of His humanity; the Dynamist maintained His humanity at the expense of His divinity. The Church had expelled Monarchianism of both types in the East and the West, but had not thus far made any definition of the Faith that reconciled the divinity with the humanity of Christ,

and a Trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit with the Unity of God. Such a definition was made necessary by the rise and spread of Arianism.

Arius was a Monarchian and Subordinationist of a new and higher type. He rejected Sabellianism with its Modal Trinity. He also rejected the doctrine of Paul of Samosata with his conception of a divinely inhabited and deified man. He recognised the divinity of Christ; but only as a subordinate ministerial God, prior in existence to all creatures, supreme in rank, and yet a creature. It was possible to hold this opinion on the basis of the חכמה of Proverbs 8, the σοφία of the Book of Wisdom, the λόγος of Philo, and the familiar distinction between God as transcendent and God as immanent; and a number of plausible texts of the Old and New Testaments might be cited in its favour.

But all these passages of Scripture were misinterpreted; and other passages, upon which the Christian Faith was built, were ignored. And this reduction of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to the rank of a secondary God, differing in no appreciable degree from an angelic being, was a reaction toward Polytheism, or at least to an angelology nearly akin to it.

Arius was excommunicated by Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in 321; but he found sympathising friends in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia, some of whom agreed with him more or less, while others regarded his opinions as tolerable. Thus a most serious situation became evident, one which ushered in a bitter and prolonged conflict that had to be dealt with. Accordingly Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, anxious to maintain the peace and unity of the Church, summoned a Council at Nice, in Bithynia, June 19, 325, to deliberate upon the matter and to decide the questions in dispute.

Three hundred and eighteen Bishops assembled, all but one, Hosius of Cordova, Spain, being from the East. The chief supporter of Arius in the Council was Eusebius of Nicomedia, but there were few that adhered to him. There

was, however, a large party that assumed a mediating position; but the great majority were zealous against the Arians and determined to exclude them from the Church.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, the chief representative of the intermediate party, presented to the Council the Creed of his Church, which, it was hoped, would be sufficient. It was a Cæsarean form of the Apostles' Creed, of which he said that he had learned it as a catechumen, professed it at his baptism, and taught it in turn as presbyter and bishop; and that it was derived from our Lord's baptismal formula. The Council accepted the Creed, so far as it went; but they deemed it insufficient to rule out Arianism, as the Arians themselves professed similar creeds, interpreting them in their own way. Accordingly the Council inserted in the Cæsarean form of the Apostles' Creed a number of phrases, which the Arians could not misinterpret or evade. These additions were not altogether satisfactory to the intermediate party, which wished to conserve the Faith of the Church and not to add to it, and which was especially in dread of Sabellianism; but they were obliged to accept the definitions of the majority, explaining these in their own way.

The Nicene Creed did not promote the peace and unity of the Church. As Duchesne says:

> "It only resulted in a short suspension of hostilities, followed by a war, abominable and fratricidal, which divided the whole of Christendom from Arabia as far as Spain, and was only quieted after sixty years of scandal that bequeathed to succeeding generations the germs of schisms from which the Church still suffers."—(*Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, II, p. 157.)

Synods and provincial councils were summoned by the different parties in which these condemned and excommunicated each other. Political and national questions became involved with those that were religious and doctrinal; and Christianity became so distracted that it could not have survived, if it had not been for the divine energy of the Holy Spirit, which guided it safely through a multitude

of disasters. During this strife and confusion a number of different parties arose, taking several different positions with reference to the questions at issue. The most important of these were the following:

(1) *The Eunomians,* or Anomœans, who held to the *anomoion* of Christ; that is, that He was "not like to the Father in essence," but simply a creature. These may be regarded as extreme Arians.

(2) *The Arians* proper, or Eudoxians, who asserted that the Son was "like the Father" with the implication that it was only a moral likeness.

(3) *The Semi-Arians,* or Macedonians, also called *Pneumatomachi,* who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

(4) *The Sabellians,* or Modalists (*v.* p. 49).

(5) *The Marcellians,* who regarded the kingdom of Christ as only temporary and not eternal, and the incarnation of Christ as only provisional.

(6) *The Photinians,* who asserted, like Paul of Samosata, that Christ was a man possessed of the Logos in exceptional fulness.

(7) *The Apollinarians,* who denied that Christ had a rational soul, its place having been taken by the Logos, the divine Son. This last raised an entirely new issue, which will be considered later on (*v.* pp. 105 *seq.*).

These seven heresies were chiefly new forms of Modalism on the one hand, or Arianism on the other, already condemned by the Church implicitly, now needing explicit rejection.

The Council of Constantinople was convoked by the Emperor Theodosius in May, 381, to determine the questions in dispute. It was composed of one hundred and fifty Bishops, all Eastern. It seemed best to the Council not to make a new Creed or additional dogmatic statements, but simply to reaffirm the Nicene Creed and to reject the seven heresies mentioned above as inconsistent with it. Accordingly this was their action in their first canon.

At this Council several bishops were challenged, the most

revered of whom was Cyril of Jerusalem. He had always been a mediating theologian, who had gradually accepted the Nicene terminology and introduced the most important part of it into a revision of the Creed of Jerusalem. This revised Creed of Jerusalem was used by Epiphanius in 374. Cyril seems to have presented this Creed to the Council in justification of himself. It was approved, and so seems to have become known as the special Creed of this Council.* The Council of Chalcedon recognised it as the *Symbol of the One Hundred and Fifty* alongside of the Nicene *Symbol of the Three Hundred and Eighteen,* both of which the Council of Chalcedon adopted in 451. The Constantinopolitan, being a combination of the Apostles' Creed with the Nicene, has taken the place of both in the usage of the Eastern Church, for baptism as well as for the Eucharist.

The received form of the Western Church differs from the Constantinopolitan chiefly in the clause "and the Son," added to the Procession of the Spirit from the Father, and in the restoration of the clause "God of God," which had been omitted by the Constantinopolitan. Both of these appear for the first time in the Creed as recited by the Council of Toledo in 589, though both are found in earlier documents. The original Nicene Creed and the later form of the Constantinopolitan are given below. The original is in ordinary type, the Constantinopolitan in italics, the Western additions are in small capitals, and omissions or substitutions in parentheses.

The Nicene Creed

We (I) believe

1. In one God, the Father Almighty, Maker *of heaven and earth, and* of all things visible and invisible:
2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father *before all worlds,* the only begotten (that is, of the substance of the Father), God of

* Hort, *Two Dissertations,* pp. 94 *seq.*

God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made (both in heaven and on earth);

3. Who for us men, and for our salvation came down *from heaven,* and was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,* and was made man;
4. *And was crucified* (ALSO) *for us under Pontius Pilate and* (HE) suffered *and was buried;*
5. And risen (HE ROSE) again on the third day *according to the Scriptures,*
6. And ascended into heaven,
7. *And sitteth on the right hand of the Father:*
8. And is coming (FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME) *again with glory,* to judge both the quick and the dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end;*
9. And (I BELIEVE) in the Holy Ghost, *the Lord, the* (AND) *Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father* AND THE SON, *who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets;*
10. (AND I BELIEVE) (*in*) *one holy catholic and apostolic Church:*
11. *We* (I) *acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins:*
12. *We* (AND I) *look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.*

§ 2. *The Son of God is the only begotten of the Father, begotten before all the worlds, consubstantial with the Father, veritable God, the Mediator of the creation.*

It is only important here to consider the additions to the Apostles' Creed made to exclude the Arians.

(1) *Begotten of the Father.* This phrase was derived from the Creed of Cæsarea. It means a real birth from God the Father, and so excludes merely figurative senses of sonship, such as the creation of the world, of Israel as a nation, of the dynasty of David, or of men in general. This, with the

phrase *only begotten Son*, also in the Creed of Cæsarea, implies the unique relation of Jesus Christ to God the Father as the only Son, the only Begotten.

The Creed of Cæsarea also had *before all worlds*, which represents that the only begotten Son was begotten prior to all things. This was left out of the Nicene Creed, probably to avoid temporal relations, and the clause, *that is, of the substance of the Father*, substituted for it. However, the revised Creed of Jerusalem of Cyril had it; and the Constantinopolitan follows that Creed in this regard. *Begotten of the Father before all worlds* does not explicitly exclude the temporal origin of the Son as prior to all other beings and things; but it implies *of the substance of the Father:* for if the birth was a real birth of the Son of God from His Father God, it implies *begotten from the substance of the Father*, as truly in the case of the Son of God as in that of all other real sons. In the stress of controversy the Nicene fathers were determined to make explicit what was implied, and to leave no loophole for Arians to escape by.

(2) *God of God.* This was also in the Creed of Cæsarea, but preceded by *the Word of God. The Word of God* was omitted because of the misuse of this term by the Arians as implying an immanent mediatorial God, and so a subordinate God. At the same time in the context of the Creed of Cæsarea, it was not open to that interpretation; because the *Word* was identical with the *Son*, and *God of God* was a parallel expression to *begotten of the Father*, so that the origin of the Son is clearly by birth and not by creation. This phrase *God of God* was not used in the Creeds of Cyril, or of Epiphanius, and so does not appear in the Constantinopolitan, as it was more fully expressed in the term *Very God of Very God.* The term *God of God*, however, was restored in Western forms of the Creed.

(3) *Light of Light.* This was also derived from the Creed of Cæsarea. It was not in the Jerusalem Creed of Cyril; but was taken up into that of Epiphanius, and so appears in the Constantinopolitan and Western forms. The Creed

of Cæsarea also had *Life of Life*, which was not used in the Nicene Creed in any of its forms, although it has a Biblical basis and a most important meaning. Both of these terms were doubtless derived from the Prologue of the Gospel of John ($1^{4, 9}$, 8^{12}; *cf.* I John $1^{2, 5}$; Heb. 1^{3}). The conception is that the Son of God, as the Light of the world, came forth from the Father as the original source of light; light being conceived, not in the physical sense, but in the religious, of the divine glory.

(4) *True God of True God.* This was not in the Creed of Eusebius. It is a stronger expression than *God of God.* Cyril's Creed used *True God* for Christ; the revision of Epiphanius added *of True God* from the Nicene Creed; and so the whole phrase appears in the Constantinopolitan and Western forms of the Nicene Creed. The Nicene fathers by adding the phrase of John 17^{3}, *ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, used of God the Father,* both for the Father and for the Son, ruled out the Arians, who could not subscribe to this: for while they might say *God of God*, meaning that the real and true God created the subordinate God as His Son, they could hardly say that the Son was the *true veritable God*, born of the *true veritable God.*

(5) *Begotten, not made.* This was another addition to the Creed of Eusebius, designed to rule out the Arians more distinctly. It was inserted in the revised Creed of Jerusalem of Epiphanius, and so appears in the Constantinopolitan and Western forms of the Creed. This phrase emphasises what was said before in *begotten of the Father.* The Arians held that the Son was *made*, or created. The Creed of Eusebius had the Biblical term *πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως* (Col. 1^{15}), which in some respects is better; but this phrase had been evaded by the Arians, and so a phrase was substituted that could not be evaded.

(6) *By whom all things were made, both in heaven and on earth.* The first part of this was taken from the Creed of Cæsarea, and was enlarged by the addition of the second

* *Cf.* I Thes. 1^{9}.

clause. But only the first part was taken into the Creed of Jerusalem, and the Constantinopolitan and Western forms of the Creed. The second part is of no real importance, as it was not contested. The doctrine that the Son is the Mediator of Creation is plain in I Cor. 8^6; Col. 1^{16}; John 1^3.

Thus far the additions to the Creed of Cæsarea were only such as to make its statements more emphatic and explicit. Certainly Eusebius and the intermediate party could hardly have objected to any of them; and they seemed to be explicit enough to exclude the Arians. The Nicene Fathers, however, were not satisfied with these additions to the Creed. They were determined to make a definition of the relation of the Son to the Father, which would express the Faith of the Church, and which the Arians could not evade; and accordingly they inserted the phrase *ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί.* This then became the term about which the subsequent conflicts centred. It appears in the revised Creed of Jerusalem of Epiphanius, and was taken up into the Constantinopolitan and Western forms of the Creed. This insertion in the Creed was made by the majority against the remonstrances of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the great body of the bishops of Syria and Palestine; and was only accepted by them with their own explanations, which did not altogether satisfy the Alexandrians and the Westerns.

The term *ὁμοούσιος* is not a Biblical term, but a philosophical, with meanings which had not yet been strictly defined by theological authority and usage; and therefore many conservative divines objected to it, all the more that it was understood during the controversy in different senses.

Οὐσία strictly means *being, actual being, real existence.* It comprehends what is essential to the existence of being. It received in the philosophy of Aristotle the place of the first of the categories; that essential being to which all qualities are attached, and in which all attributes inhere. The Latin equivalent in usage was *substantia,* although that word had a different origin from *οὐσία.* *Οὐσία* corresponded

more properly with *essentia*, and *substantia* with ὑπόστασις, but the usage was still fluctuating.

There can be no doubt that the Western Hosius of Cordova, the chief representative of the Emperor at the Council, was responsible for the insertion of this phrase in the Creed. The Latin *substantia* was in his mind, and he used οὐσία as its equivalent in meaning. Accordingly ὁμοούσιος meant *consubstantialis, of one and the same substance.*

The terms *substantia* and *consubstantialis* had become fixed in meaning in the West in the conflict with Sabellianism, and therefore could not be interpreted in a Sabellian way. But in the East ὁμοούσιος had been discredited in the conflict with Paul of Samosata, and to the Easterns suggested Monarchianism. This difference of usage between the East and the West stood in the way of the full acceptance of the term by those who were not Arians, yet wished to be faithful to their local Creeds and their traditional opinions, and were afraid of the Monarchian tendencies of the new phraseology. The conflict in the East made it evident that ὁμοούσιος was in fact capable, not only of the interpretation given to it by Paul of Samosata, that it involved a supreme Being from whom both Father and Son were derived; but also of the Sabellian interpretation, that the Son was identically the same with the Father, the only difference being nominal or modal. These and other misinterpretations were recognised as possible not only by the conservative opponents of the phrase, but also by the orthodox advocates of it.*

The Eastern misunderstandings and misinterpretations of ὁμοούσιος had to be overcome before the Nicene Creed could be cordially adopted. Unfortunately the Creed was forced upon the East by imperial authority, and the Eastern conscience rebelled. Subsequently the imperial authority vacillated, taking now one side and then another, thus promoting confusion; and physical violence too often as-

* *V.* Hilary, *de Synodis*, 68; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 42 *seq.*

sumed the place of learned arguments and conscientious convictions. Some of the intermediate party, who were dissatisfied with the term ὁμοούσιος, proposed the term ὁμοιούσιος, *of like substance.* But it soon became evident that this term by its indefiniteness opened a door to various interpretations; for it must be asked: *in what respect* or *to what extent* is the likeness of substance between the Father and the Son, and is it really meant that the likeness is that of a real son by generation, or of a figurative son by creation, or a legal son by adoption?

Several attempts at explanation were made, the most important of which were: ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα, *like in all things;* ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν, *like in substance,* and ἀπαραλλάκτως ὅμοιος, *like without variation.* But all these also had to be explained, and they were capable of more misinterpretation and evasion than the Nicene ὁμοούσιος. Gradually it became plain that ὁμοιούσιος was no proper substitute for ὁμοούσιος; for while ὁμοούσιος was subject to misinterpretation, all the other terms that had been proposed were subject to still greater misunderstanding. Accordingly, so soon as there was a general agreement to rule out all these misinterpretations, the term ὁμοούσιος began to assume a technical meaning, acceptable to all but the Arians and the Monarchians.

This agreement was not reached, however, until a term was proposed to set forth clearly and distinctly the differences of Father, Son, and Spirit. The Westerns had an appropriate term *persona,* but the Easterns had not. This had from the beginning made it easier for the Westerns than for the Easterns to accept the Nicene terminology. *Persona* had long been in use in the West in the sense of *character, function,* preserved in the English *personate;* and so *personal* is in theological usage *functional,* and not *individual.* The Greek term ultimately selected for the Trinitarian distinction was ὑπόστασις. This Greek word had a variety of meanings which might be misleading, and which for a long time prevented the use of it for Trinitarian relations. In

fact etymologically and in common usage it is the exact equivalent of *substantia*.* Athanasius recognised that those who said τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, and those who said μία ὑπόστασις, differed only in terminology, and not in reality; and that therefore the terms should be avoided. Athanasius was not a stickler for words. He did not battle for terminology, but for the doctrine itself; and he recognised, and stated more than once, that the theologians were really agreed, though they used different terms to express the same meaning. However, it was necessary to find a term upon which the Church could agree. It was the merit of the great Cappadocians, Basil († 379), Gregory of Nyssa († 394), and Gregory Nazianzen († 390), that they used ὑπόστασις for the Trinitarian distinctions in such a definite and convincing way as to win general consent.

Οὐσία is the common term for Father, Son, and Spirit; ὑπόστασις is the particular term for the special property of each of the Three. Ὑπόστασις, as thus used, was not inserted in the Creed; but it became the recognised traditional term for the East, for the different functions of the Trinity, as *persona* for the West.

This is one of many instances in the History of Doctrine, in which the consensus of the Church has been more easily gained by general discussion and unofficial action than by official decisions, which are often premature. The technical terms now became: *One divine Substance in three Hypostases, or Persons*, that is, in three functional subsistences with three special properties. This is more fully expressed and carefully stated in the Athanasian Creed, 3–28 (*v.* pp. 102 *seq.*).

It is evident that this terminology is inadequate. The terms are open to misconception and misinterpretation. It is as easy for moderns to object to them as it was for the ancients. Some of the ancients objected to them because they were Arians, or other similar heretics, who were ruled out by them from orthodoxy; others objected because they were conservatives and disliked any additions to the Creed,

* *Cf.* Heb. 1^3, and Hilary, *de Synodis*, 84.

especially such as were of doubtful meaning, and might be interpreted in the sense of Monarchianism in its various forms, which the Church had long since rejected. When it became evident that some terms must be used, they earnestly sought and zealously contended for other and, as they thought, better terms. The modern objectors, however, content themselves with an easy criticism of the terminology, and ignore the historic consensus of the Church as to their definite meaning. They do not propose any other terminology, and it is quite evident that they cannot invent one.

The Nicene divines were fully aware that they had not solved the mystery of the Holy Trinity. They were content for the time to rule out Arianism as a dangerous heresy, and to maintain the unity of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, over against a reaction toward Polytheism. The peril of a reaction toward Monarchianism, which the Conservatives feared and dreaded, was provided against by the distinction between the properties of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in the three great sections of the Creed; and when this was found insufficient, by an interpretation of the differences by the use of *ὑπόστασις*, or *persona*, for the functions and characteristic properties of the Three—terms inadequate, it is true, yet having definite historic meanings in the consensus of the Church. These terms must be explained anew to each generation by the doctors of the Church, both to the ministry and to the people, as the only way of avoiding the antithetical errors of Arianism and Monarchianism, to which different minds tend in accordance with circumstances and education.

§ 3. *The Incarnation of the Son of God is defined as a coming down from heaven, and a becoming flesh and man, for the salvation of men.*

The third article of the Nicene Creed is based on the third article of the Apostles' Creed in its Eastern forms. The Nicene Creed reads: *Who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was incarnate, and made man.*

(1) The phrase *who for our salvation* was taken from the Creed of Cæsarea. It corresponds with the term *Saviour*, which was originally in the Apostles' Creed, in the second article, as in the Symbol of the Fish, and was subsequently omitted in the Old Roman Creed when the six acts of salvation were specified (*v.* p. 46). The Nicene Creed prefers *for us men.* This was possibly suggested by the final clause, *made man*, for us men made man. Both of these clauses were taken up into the revised Creed of Jerusalem, and are in the Constantinopolitan and Western forms of the Creed.

(2) *Came down*, that is, *from heaven*, as the Creed of Epiphanius and the Constantinopolitan have it. This was not in the Creed of Cæsarea, but was inserted by the Nicene Fathers, in order probably to emphasise the fact that the incarnation was a voluntary act of the Son of God Himself, in accordance with the usage of the Gospel of John and over against the subordinationism of the Arians.

(3) Σαρκωθέντα, *was made flesh, incarnate.*

This was taken from the Creed of Cæsarea. It is based on John 1^{14}.* *Flesh* here means, not the flesh of the body, but man as flesh in antithesis to God (*v.* p. 80). The Creed of Epiphanius has here *of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin;* and so this appears also in the Constantinopolitan and Western forms. The Creed of Cæsarea and other Eastern Creeds omit the Virgin birth; because their statement of the Incarnation is based on the prologue of John's Gospel, and not on Luke, as are the Roman Creed and most of the other forms of the Apostles' Creed (*v.* p. 81).

(4) Ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, *made man.* This is a Nicene substitute for the ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον of the Eusebian Creed, which was not sufficiently definite to emphasise the humanity itself. The Creed of Jerusalem of Cyril has this term, which is used also in the revised Creed of Jerusalem of Epiphanius, and the Constantinopolitan.

The remaining Christological articles of the Nicene and

* *Cf.* Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I : 10.

Constantinopolitan Creeds differ from the Apostles' Creed only in certain phrases and in no important particular, with the exception of the article as to the Second Advent, which is enlarged from the usual term of the Nicene Creed, *coming to judge the living and the dead,* into *coming again with glory to judge the living and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end;* at first in the revised Creed of Jerusalem of Epiphanius, and then in the Constantinopolitan. The additional clause was probably intended to rule out Marcellus, who misinterpreted I Cor. 15^{24} to the effect that the reign of Christ would cease when He delivered up the kingdom to the Father.

§ 4. *The article on the Holy Spirit is enlarged in the Constantinopolitan Creed so as to state that He is Lord, the Giver of Life, who inspired the prophets, who proceedeth from the Father, and is to be glorified jointly with Father and Son.*

The Creed of Cæsarea had simply: *also in one Holy Spirit,* followed by the Nicene Creed: *and in the Holy Spirit* (*v.* p. 75). The Creed of Jerusalem of Cyril had: *and in one Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who spake in the prophets.* This was enlarged in the Creed of Epiphanius by the addition of *the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets.* The words *One* and *Paraclete* were omitted. These additions were due to the controversy with the Pneumatomachians, or Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

(1) *The Lord.* The same lordship is here ascribed to the Holy Spirit as to the Son of God, and in the same sense, as divine, just as in the Athanasian Creed (*v.* p. 104).

(2) *The Giver of Life.* The Holy Spirit is life-giving in the creation of the world (Gen. 1), and in the regeneration of Christians (John 3). He is the *Spirit of life* (Rom. 8^{2}).

(3) *Who proceedeth from the Father.* The Holy Spirit is from the Father just as truly as the Son, but not in the same sense. The Holy Spirit was not Son and therefore not be-

gotten. The term *proceedeth* was used to express the relation of the Spirit to the Father, on the basis of John 15^{26}.

The influence of the Athanasian Creed eventually effected the insertion of the *filioque* in the Western form of the Nicene Creed; and so it became the official doctrine of the West that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father *and the Son*. The Orientals have always objected to this insertion, both as unauthorised by the consensus of the Church and as incorrect. The consideration of this addition must be reserved for our study of the Athanasian Creed and the subsequent conciliar decisions of the Western Church. The same general questions arise with reference to the relation of the Spirit to the Father, as to that of the Son. The Constantinopolitan Creed does not state this explicitly, but implies it. Accordingly the Holy Spirit also is *true God of true God, not made, consubstantial with the Father.*

The Spirit could no more be a third God than the Son a second. The Spirit could no more be a creature than could the Son. The Procession of the Spirit from the Father was as truly eternal as the generation of the Son. And so the Athanasian Creed states that *the Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son, not made, nor created, nor begotten; but proceeding* (*v.* p. 104).

(4) *Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.*

The worship of the Holy Spirit and the ascription of glory to Him as God is here avowed, just as truly as the worship and ascription of glory to the Father and the Son.

(5) *Who spake by the prophets.* This identifies the Holy Spirit, not only with the divine Spirit who inspired the prophets of the Old Testament, but also with the Holy Spirit who inspired the apostles and prophets of the Church in accordance with the promise and gift of Christ Himself.

The original Nicene Creed gives nothing of the work of the Holy Spirit; but the Creed of Epiphanius, as based on the Creed of Jerusalem, gives the same three activities as the Apostles' Creed, in most of its forms, though in slightly

different language. The Creed of Cyril declares belief: (*a*) *in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,* (*b*) *in one holy catholic Church,* and (*c*) *in the resurrection of the flesh and in life everlasting.* The Creed of Epiphanius changes the order to the usual one: (*a*) *one holy catholic and apostolic Church,* (*b*) *one baptism for the remission of sins,* (*c*) *the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.* The Constantinopolitan follows the Creed as given by Epiphanius.

Thus the Nicene Creed in its Constantinopolitan and Western forms embraces, like the Apostles' Creed, the Trinitarian formula and the twelve articles of the Christian Faith. The articles on the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit are richer and fuller, to rule out the Arian and Macedonian heresies, which threatened to destroy Christianity no less than their predecessors, Ebionitism, and Gnosticism, and Monarchianism in its modal and dynamic forms.

All Christian Churches hold to this Creed as the ecumenical Creed of the Church. The great Protestant Churches, no less than the Greek and Roman, reject all those heresies condemned once for all in the accepted form of the Nicene Creed; and they cannot tolerate the dynamic Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata in its modern representations, any more than the modal form of Sabellius, or the Arian and Semi-Arian heresies.

CHAPTER IV

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

§ 1. *The Athanasian Creed was probably composed in the fifth century as two separate treatises for use in the School of Lérins, the one defining the Catholic Faith in the Trinity, the other the Right Faith in the Incarnation. These were subsequently combined, enlarged, and given an official character by the addition of the damnatory clauses.*

The name Athanasius is by tradition attached to the Creed, originally with the meaning that it set forth the doctrine of Athanasius, just as the doctrine of the Apostles' Creed was the doctrine of the Apostles; later with the meaning of authorship. But only the doctrine of the Trinity in the first part of the Creed can be said to be Athanasian, and even that is Augustinian. The doctrine of Incarnation of the second part is certainly later than Augustine. The origin of this Creed is shrouded in mystery, and there are several theories about it.

The Athanasian Creed, like the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, had an original nucleus, which grew by revision into its present form. The original Creed gave only the Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity (3–11, 13–18, 21–27). This presents the Athanasian doctrine in an Augustinian form, and was doubtless composed by one of the theologians of the School of Lérins, in Gaul, as a manual of instruction for the monastic Schools—either Honoratus († 429) or Hilary († 450) or Vincent († 450), all able and distinguished theologians. This section presupposes the heresy of the Macedonians or Pneumatomachi, condemned by the Coun-

cil of Constantinople in 381, and could not have been composed much earlier. This section of the Creed received in course of time the additions 12, 19–20, which betray another hand. The damnatory clauses at the beginning and the end (1–2, 28) evidently came from another author. They were not appropriate to a manual of instruction, but only to a public and official statement of the Faith over against dangerous heresies; and it is improbable that they were attached to the Creed when it was simply a manual of instruction, or until it had become a recognised official document of the Church.

The second section, giving the Right Faith in the Incarnation (30–37), was originally issued separately; but the sections have essentially the same style, form, and mode of thought, and doubtless were composed by the same author. The second section was modelled after the first, and therefore must be somewhat later. This section shows no traces of the Nestorian or Eutychian controversies, or of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon; and therefore must have been composed before the *Commonitorium* of Vincent (*c.* 432–4). But it distinctly rejects Apollinarianism; and therefore must be later than 377 and 382, when Roman Synods declared against that heresy.

This section also received additions in 38–40. These additions were made to complete the Christological statements, for the same reason that similar additions were made to the Nicene Creed in the Constantinopolitan form. They are based on a form of the Apostles' Creed later than that of the fourth century and earlier than that of the seventh.

The clauses 41–43 are an enlargement of the article of the Resurrection of the Dead, in the same spirit as the damnatory clauses, which were placed at the beginning and end of this section, 29, 44. These clauses, however, were added when the two sections were combined; because 29 is of the nature of a seam, and the term *Catholic Faith* of 44 is the term of the first section, and not that of the second, which is *Right Faith.*

§ 2. *The first portion of the Creed sets forth the Nicene Faith in an Augustinian form. It abandons the ancient Trinitarian division of the Creed; and in order to rule out the Pneumatomachi, treats of the three Persons of the Trinity in the same articles, in their common possession of the essential attributes of Deity, and at the same time distinguishes their separate functions.*

The first part of the Athanasian Creed sets forth the Nicene Faith in the Augustinian form as follows:

3. *The Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;*

4. *Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance (Essence).*

5. *For there is one Person of the Father: another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.*

6. *But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal.*

7. *Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.*

8. *The Father uncreate (uncreated): the Son uncreate (uncreated): and the Holy Ghost uncreate (uncreated).*

9. *The Father incomprehensible (unlimited): the Son incomprehensible (unlimited): and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible (unlimited, or infinite).*

10. *The Father eternal: the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.*

11. *And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal.*

12. *As also there are not three uncreated, nor three incomprehensible (infinite): but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible (infinite).*

13. *So likewise the Father is Almighty: the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.*

14. *And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty.*

15. *So the Father is God: the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.*

16. *And yet they are not three Gods: but one God.*

17. *So likewise the Father is Lord: the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.*

18. *And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.*

19. *For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by Himself to be God and Lord:*

20. *So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.*

21. *The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.*

22. *The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten.*

23. *The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding.*

24. *So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.*

25. *And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another (there is nothing before, or after: nothing greater or less).*

26. *But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal.*

27. *So that in all things, as aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped.*

The distinctive features are the following:

(1) The doctrine of the divine Spirit is not given in a third part of the Creed, as in the earlier Creeds, but is given with the doctrine of the Father and the Son, in one part together. The Holy Spirit, accordingly, has the same predicates as the Son and the Father, except that the special properties of each are distinguished. This doctrine of the Holy Spirit presupposes the heresy of the Macedonians, or Pneumatomachi, condemned by the first Council of Constantinople.

(2) The term *persona* is used for the definition of the three Trinitarian distinctions, as in Augustine, and in accord with the *hypostasis* of the Cappadocians, implying the controversies as to the Nicene Creed with the Semi-Arians, resulting in the reconciliation of practically all of them but the Macedonians. The brief statement of the Constantinopolitan as to the Holy Spirit is thus greatly enlarged. The Constantinopolitan had: *and in the Holy Spirit, (a) the Lord and Giver of Life; (b) who proceedeth from the Father; (c) who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.* The Athanasian begins and ends with the assertion of the worship of the Spirit together with the Father and the Son (3, 27). So also it ascribes to the Spirit equality in glory with the Father and Son (6). The Constantinopolitan procession of the Spirit from the Father is enlarged into *The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding.*

The Lord and Giver of Life of the Constantinopolitan is enlarged into sections 13–18 and later into 19–20.

The Athanasian now goes beyond the Constantinopolitan

in attributing to the Spirit the divine characteristics of the Son, according to the Nicene Creed, thus: *not made, uncreated* (8, 23), *eternal* (6, 26). To these it adds: *incomprehensible* (*immensus*) (9, 12). The consubstantiality of the Son with the Father is extended to the Holy Spirit in the terms: *Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance* (3, 4); *such as the Father is: such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost* (7); and in the repeated assertions of unity: *And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal. As also there are not three uncreated: nor three incomprehensible: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible* (11–12); *And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty* (14); *And yet they are not three Gods: but one God* (16); *And yet not three Lords: but one Lord* (18).

The personal distinctions are also clearly stated in the Athanasian Creed, and that which is implied in the Constantinopolitan becomes explicit. Thus, after the assertion of the worship of the *Trinity in Unity*, the first thing that is said is: *neither confounding the Persons* (4). *For there is one Person of the Father: another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost* (5). The personal distinctions are finally stated as follows: *The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten* (21). *The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten* (22). *The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding* (23). *So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts* (24). *And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another* (25). *But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal* (26).

It is thus evident that the Athanasian Creed is an important advance on the Nicene-Constantinopolitan, in making explicit what the Creed implied, and so ruling out the errors as to the divine Spirit, and explaining the Trinity in such a way as to remove any possibility of interpreting the Nicene Faith in a Sabellian direction, as was at first the fear of the Semi-Arians.

§ 3. *The second part of the Creed defines the Right Faith in the Incarnation over against the Apollinarians. The two natures of Christ are carefully distinguished, and any kind of confusion of the two repudiated. The completeness of the human nature is maintained, especially its possession of a rational soul.*

The second part of the Creed is as follows:

29. *Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe faithfully the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

30. [*For*] *the Right Faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;*

31. *God, of the Substance* (*Essence*) *of the Father: begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance* (*Essence*) *of His Mother, born in the world.*

32. *Perfect God: and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.*

33. *Equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood.*

34. *Who although He be God and Man: yet He is not two, but one Christ.*

35. *One: not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by assumption of the Manhood into God.*

36. *One altogether; not by confusion of Substance* (*Essence*)*: but by unity of Person.*

37. *For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ.*

This section defines the *Right Faith;* and it is summed up in the term *Incarnation* (29), as distinguished from the first part of the Creed, which was defined as the *Catholic Faith* in the Holy Trinity. This *Right Faith* presupposes a *wrong Faith,* and the conflict between the two, which began with Apollinarianism. The statements of the Creed are so framed as to exclude the Apollinarian heresies; but there is nothing in them that implies a knowledge of Nestorianism or Monophysitism. The two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, are carefully distinguished; but the interest of the Creed is to define the human nature, and to avoid any confusion of it with the divine in the Apollinarian fash-

ion. As to the divine nature, this Creed simply adheres to the statement of the Constantinopolitan.

The statement begins with the general definition of the Right Faith in the Incarnation:

The Right Faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man (30).

Christ is both divine and human, in accordance with the Nicene Faith. The divine nature is now defined as *of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds* (31), both Nicene terms; and as *perfect God* (32), *equal to the Father* (33), which may be regarded as the equivalent of the Nicene: *God of God, Very God of Very God.*

The definition of the *human nature* of Christ is, however, an advance upon the Nicene-Constantinopolitan statements; as the human nature is brought into sharp antithesis with the divine in the several clauses. Thus: *Man of the substance of His Mother, born in the world* (31); *Perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting* (32).

These terms are not in the Constantinopolitan Creed, and their doctrine is there only by implication in the terms: *Was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man.* It was necessary to affirm over against the Apollinarians that the substance of the human nature did not descend with the Logos from pre-existence in heaven, but was derived from the human mother; and that the human nature was perfect, having a *rational soul* as well as *human flesh*, and not imperfect as Apollinaris would have it, without a *rational soul*, whose place in the human nature was taken by the pre-existing Logos. It is significant that the technical term of the Nestorian controversy, *Mother of God*, is missing here. It could hardly have been left out after the Nestorian controversy had been determined by the Council of Chalcedon, whose decision had undisputed ecumenical authority in the West, and was opposed only in the East.

The Creed now proceeds to assert the unity of the divine natures without confusion. In this section it approaches

nearer to the Chalcedonian rejection of Eutychianism: yet it does not go beyond the Tome of Leo and the doctrine of Augustine, which represented the Faith of the Church before the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies; and the terms that are used are such as to reject these heresies implicitly, though not so explicitly as the formula of Chalcedon. The unity of natures is thus expressed:

Who although He be God and Man: yet is He not two but one Christ (34). *One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by assumption of the Manhood into God* (35). *One altogether: not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person* (36). *For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ* (37).

This is a simple assertion of the two natures in the one Christ, and that there is no confusion of the two substances by the union. The only term here that is involved in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies is *non confusione*, which appears in the Chalcedonian formula as *inconfuse* (ἀσυγχύτως). The other technical terms, *immutabiliter, indivise, inseparabiliter* (ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως), do not appear, as would undoubtedly have been the case if the Creed had been composed after Chalcedon; because these three terms, much more than the one used, were the essential ones in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies. The Monophysites, indeed, could have subscribed without hesitation to the Athanasian: *not by confusion of substance.* The confusion here thought of is that of Apollinaris, as the intermediate statement shows: *One not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh,* because of the coming of the pre-existing heavenly Man into human flesh; *but by assumption of the manhood into God.* It is true that the latter statement is inconsistent with Nestorianism, as is still more the use of the term *person* in this connection: *by unity of person.* But the use of the term *person* here is a Western usage prior to Chalcedon, which does not therefore imply Chalcedonian influence. On the other hand, the phrase *assumption of the manhood into God* might be

interpreted in favour of Monophysitism. We must, therefore, conclude that these statements of the Athanasian Creed were made without regard to the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies, but only to exclude the earlier errors as to the human nature of Christ. It is also noteworthy that the confusion here rejected is a confusion of *substance;* whereas the Monophysite controversy and the Chalcedonian formula have to do with a confusion of *natures.*

The final clause of this section, in its comparison of the union of God and Man in Christ to the union of the rational soul and the flesh in man, is open to misinterpretation in a Nestorian direction. It would later have been regarded as incautious. The very language shows that it was directed against Apollinarianism.

CHAPTER V

THE FAITH OF CHALCEDON

§ 1. *The Christological controversies, begun by Apollinaris and continued by Nestorius and Cyril, Eutyches and Leo, and other lesser theologians, made it necessary to summon the Council of Chalcedon to determine them in* 451.

The Trinitarian controversies were finally settled at the Council of Constantinople. Apollinaris made the transition from the Trinitarian to the Christological period. His heresy was rejected by the Council of Constantinople, but no definition of the Faith was made over against him. However, the Athanasian Creed in the West, in its statement of the right Faith in the Incarnation, ruled out Apollinarianism. All the world now became involved in Christological controversies, with Constantinople as the centre of conflict, as Alexandria had been during the struggle with Arianism.

In 428 Nestorius was consecrated Bishop of Constantinople. Soon after his accession he objected to the term *Theotokos* as applied to the Virgin Mary, and endeavoured to distinguish between the man Jesus, born of Mary, and the Son of God united to him. Nestorius does not seem to have denied the personality of the Word, or Son of God; but he distinguished too sharply between the two natures, and, to say the least, did not clearly recognise their unity in one person. This greatly excited the Church in all parts, especially in Alexandria and Rome; and Pope Cœlestine and Cyril of Alexandria united in opposition.

Cyril wrote a letter to Nestorius in 429, remonstrating, and urging him to restore peace by using the term *Theotokos*, to which Nestorius replied in an unsatisfactory manner.

In 430 Cyril wrote a second letter, in which he explained the right doctrine of the Incarnation, and asked Nestorius whether he held it and taught it. Nestorius was still more unsatisfactory in his reply. Cyril then informed Pope Cœlestine of Nestorius' position; and a Council, held in Rome in August, condemned Nestorius, giving him ten days in which to recant. This Council committed the discipline of Nestorius to Cyril. He held a provincial Council in Alexandria, which agreed to a third letter to Nestorius with twelve anathemas, which Nestorius was required to subscribe. This letter, together with that of the Pope, was sent to Constantinople in charge of four bishops, who thus took with them the authority of these two great apostolical sees.

Nestorius, however, would not yield; but instead issued twelve anathemas in response, to which he secured the support of John of Antioch, Andrew of Samosata, and others. A Council was assembled at Ephesus in June, 431, which approved Cyril's second letter, and condemned and deposed Nestorius. When John of Antioch and other Eastern prelates arrived, they organised a separate council and deposed Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus, not for heresy but for violation of conciliar rights. This brought on a bitter contest, which continued until 433, when John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria were reconciled, and Nestorius was rejected by all.

The Nestorian heresy, which exaggerated the difference of the two natures of Christ, naturally brought about the antithetical heresy of underrating the difference. In 448 Eutyches, an archimandrite of Constantinople, was charged by Eusebius of Dorylæum before a Synod of Constantinople under the presidency of Bishop Flavian with denying the reality of the human nature of Christ after the Incarnation. He admitted that there was a union of two natures, the divine and the human, in the Incarnation; but he denied that these remained two after the Incarnation, asserting that the two natures were united into *one nature*.

Eutyches was condemned by the Synod. He then ap-

pealed to Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria, espoused his cause; and a Council was held at Ephesus (449), under his presidency, which acted in such a rude, unjust, and tyrannical manner that it has ever since been known as the *Robber Synod.* Its authority was not recognised by the leading sees. It restored Eutyches, and excommunicated Flavian of Constantinople and other representatives of orthodoxy.

Leo had sent his opinion by delegates in a document known as the *Tome.* This the Council would not hear, and they treated his representatives with disrespect and violence.

The death of the Emperor Theodosius in 450 brought a change of policy. Another Council was called, which met at Chalcedon in 451.

§ 2. *The Council of Chalcedon condemned Nestorianism and Monophysitism; and defined the Faith in the Person of Christ as composed of two natures, the divine and the human, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one Hypostasis.*

The Council condemned Eutyches and Dioscurus, subscribed the tome of Leo, the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and his letter to John of Antioch. It then issued its own definition of the Faith, as follows:

"Following the holy fathers we teach with one voice that the Son [of God] and our Lord Jesus Christ is to be confessed as one and the same [Person], that He is perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, very God and very man, of a reasonable soul and [human] body consisting, consubstantial with the Father as touching His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as touching His manhood; made in all things like unto us, sin only excepted; begotten of His Father before the worlds according to His Godhead; but in these last days for us men and for our salvation born [into the world] of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God according to His manhood. This one and the same Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son [of God] must be confessed to be in two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably [united],

and that without the distinction of natures being taken away by such union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and being united in one Person and Hypostasis, not separated or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only Begotten, God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets of old time have spoken concerning Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ hath taught us, and as the Creed of the fathers hath delivered to us."

Nestorianism and Eutychianism are explicitly refuted. Nestorianism so emphasised the difference of the two natures as to make the unity an ethical one of two different persons. Eutychianism so emphasised the unity of nature as to do away with the two natures after the Incarnation. It makes of them only one nature, containing human and divine attributes and characteristics. Hence the Chalcedonian formula insists, over against Nestorianism, that the one Hypostasis, the divine Christ, was born of the Virgin, and not merely that the human nature of Christ was thus born; and that the two natures were indivisibly and inseparably united in the one Christ. It insists over against Eutychianism that the human nature remained after the union distinct from the divine nature, inconfused and unchangeable: the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, "but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one Hypostasis."

Many questions remained still undetermined at Chalcedon. Nestorianism was driven from the Roman Empire, and sought refuge in Persia. But the Monophysites continued to disturb the Church in the Empire for a long time, and subsequently divided into many warring parties.

These Monophysites did not agree with the extravagances of Eutyches, which were rejected by the definitions of Chalcedon. They were rather like the Semi-Arians in their attitude toward the Nicene Faith. Many of them were willing to accept the Chalcedonian formula, if they could interpret it in their own way; but they were not willing to accept the interpretation of their opponents. They regarded

these as reacting toward Nestorianism. The fundamental question in dispute was as to the real meaning of the Chalcedonian formula. There is a variation of reading: the one *of two natures*, ἐκ δύο φύσεων; the other *in two natures*, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν. The present Greek text reads the former; all Latin translations, *in duabus naturis*, but with editorial recognition of variation. There is a difference among scholars as to which is the original. Baur and Dorner are the chief among those who think the former original, and it seems to me that they are correct. It agrees better with the context, especially with the verb γνωρίζειν. It is also favoured by the well-known principle of criticism that the more difficult reading is more likely to be correct.* In the context it is sufficiently clear as rejecting Eutychianism, but apart from the context might be interpreted in its favour. There was no sufficient reason to change ἐν into ἐκ; but there was a strong reason to change ἐκ into ἐν, in order to deprive the Monophysites of a seeming support to their views. Gieseler, Neander, Hefele, and Schaff are the chiefs of a majority of scholars who favour an original ἐν, on the ground that the change to ἐκ was made in the interest of the Monophysites. But this seems improbable in view of the constant conflict with them from the Council of Chalcedon until their final separation from the Church. This might account for the insertion of ἐκ in some texts of the formula, but not in the official texts recognised by the Greek Church as valid. The several parties would have watched over this terminology with the greatest care. The difference is really only one between the Greek original and the Latin translation.

The symbol does not say *one* nature from *two* natures, but *one and the same Christ from two natures*, and this is essentially the same as *in two natures*. The unity of Christ and the two distinct natures are taught equally in both cases.

The difficulty to the Monophysites was that the unity did not seem to be sufficiently recognised by their opponents. The Monophysites did not in fact take any position contrary

* *V.* Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, p. 89.

to the distinction of natures *inconfusedly* and *unchangeably;* they rather emphasised *indivisibly* and *inseparably.* They recognised the distinction, and yet emphasised the unity. They could agree to the union of two natures in *one and the same Christ,* and it might have been wiser if the Council had not in its subsequent clause asserted that the unity was in the *one hypostasis.* They did not object to the one person; they maintained it vigorously against the Nestorians; but they thought the unity was something more than hypostatic, and so indeed it was.

If the contest of the theologians had continued within the Church, distinctions made later by Leontius of Byzantium and John of Damascus might have reconciled the Monophysites to the Chalcedonian formula; for both the Greeks and the Latins were compelled to reckon with certain differences between the human nature of Christ and the human nature of other men, due to the union of the human nature with the divine in the one and the same Christ.

(1) It was agreed by all that Christ was *without sin,* whether original or actual; and that He was from birth innocent, and in His life perfect in holiness. He was in the likeness of sinful flesh, but His flesh was not sinful. It was agreed by orthodox theologians that the human nature of Christ must have some special qualities because of the union. The human nature was not that of an individual united to the Logos, which would be Nestorianism. It was that of a man who gained his individuality first by union with the Logos, Who assumed human nature, not the nature of an individual. It was for the integrity and completeness of Christ's human nature that the Church stood; not that His nature had not its own special characteristics as suitable for union with the divine nature. His nature was normal and not abnormal; having completeness as the ideal of humanity, not according to the reality of fallen humanity.

(2) There were controversies among the Monophysites as to whether the human nature of Christ had other special qualities, such as: whether Christ's human nature was

limited in knowledge, or was a sharer in the complete and perfect knowledge of the divine mind. The debate raged especially about the words of Christ: "But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13^{32}). Was this saying exactly true, or only economically true: that is, true relatively to its communication to others, not true in itself?

(3) Were the miracles of Christ wrought by His omnipotence as God, or by virtue of His prophetic possession of the divine Spirit as Man?

(4) As to His body, was it incorruptible, or corruptible? The Monophysites raised this question, and divided upon it into Severians, *Φθαρτολάτραι*, and Julianists, *Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται*; the latter insisting upon the incorruptibility of the flesh of Christ as well as upon its life-giving property, in accordance with II Tim. 1^{10}. This, indeed, seems to be logically involved in the life-giving property taught by Cyril in his letter to Nestorius, which has semi-symbolical character; although the weight of theological opinion is against it.

The chief difficulty with the Chalcedonian decision, one that was deeply felt in ancient times and is at present regarded as most serious, is the seeming limitation of the unity to the hypostasis, or person of the Logos. There is certainly an ambiguity in the use of the term *person* that is disturbing; for *person*, as used in connection with the distinctions of the Holy Trinity, has a different meaning from *person* as used in the Chalcedonian formula, as the point of union of the human and divine natures of Christ. The latter is certainly something more than the hypostasis of the Second Person of the Trinity, which did not include individuality. Individuality can be predicated of the one God only, not of the three Trinitarian hypostases. How much more the personality, that united the natures, was than the hypostasis of the Logos, has not been defined by the Church. As Dorner shows, the Chalcedonian formula does not deny human personality to the Man Jesus. It simply denies that there is a human personality separate and distinct from the

hypostasis of the Second Person of the Trinity, and asserts the unity in the one person of Christ.

Leontius of Byzantium was the great theologian, who was able to speak the reconciling word, solving this the chief difficulty in the Chalcedonian formula. He represented that the human nature was not without a hypostasis, but was enhypostatised in the Logos. John of Damascus, the great Greek scholastic, subsequently taught that the hypostasis was *composite;* and that there was a communication of attributes.

The difficulty involved in such an entire separation of natures, as seemed to the Monophysites to be involved in the Chalcedonian formula, was overcome by the doctrine of *ἀντίδοσις ἰδιωμάτων*, an exchange or communication of properties of the one nature to the other. From the very nature of the case this communication is on the divine side and not on the human. This communication of properties of the divine nature to the human nature of Christ, while it refers chiefly to His state of exaltation and especially to the eucharistic presence, also refers in part to the state of humiliation and explains those special characteristics of the human nature of Christ upon which the Monophysites insisted, and which seem to be based on the New Testament.

Another term was also useful, especially in John of Damascus, namely, *περιχώρησις*, which, as interpreted, represents that the divine nature of Christ interpenetrated and pervaded the human nature. The two natures were not merely in external juxtaposition. On the other hand, this exchange of attributes and interpenetration of natures threatens a confusion of the two natures of Christ, and tends in the direction of Monophysitism, especially if referred to the act of incarnation. This certainly was not designed by Leontius or John of Damascus, who maintained the Chalcedonian formula, and who guarded themselves sufficiently from the peril of Monophysitism. They were explaining the Chalcedonian doctrine, and not changing it or modifying it. The Chalcedonian formula is not responsible for

their doctrinal explanations: but it is not inconsistent with them; and the Doctors of the Church, East and West, have regarded their explanations as normal and correct. It is altogether probable that, if the Monophysites had remained in the Roman Empire, they would have been reconciled by these explanations, which gained a semi-official character.

§ 3. *The efforts to reconcile the Monophysites by the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno* (482), *distinguishing between the Chalcedon definition of Faith and the opinion of the Council, and by the unjust condemnation of the three Chapters of the great Antiochian divines, long deceased, by edict of Justinian and the Fifth Ecumenical Council, deservedly failed.*

The controversy with the Monophysites pursued its weary way for several centuries, from the Council of Chalcedon until the Sixth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in 680, when it was finally overcome in the Greek Church.

In 482 the Emperor Zeno, under the advice of Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, issued his *Henoticon*, which reduced the questions at issue to a minimum, and sought by a general formula to reconcile the Monophysites. It reaffirmed the rejection of Nestorius and Eutyches, condemned those who divide or confuse the two natures, and maintained the entire oneness of Christ, without using either hypostasis or nature. But it then goes on to anathematise all who judge otherwise, "whether at Chalcedon or any other Synod whatever." Thus it reaffirms the doctrine of Chalcedon, but discredits the Council. This was evidently unfair, and a dishonourable yielding to partisan prejudices. The *Henoticon* was accepted by the Patriarch of Alexandria; but he did not succeed in the reconciliation of the Egyptian Monophysites. It was adopted by the Armenians and gained symbolical authority in that country, which separated from the Greek Empire under the Persian rule. The Church in Armenia has remained independent under its own patriarch until the present time. The *Henoticon* gained partial acceptance in other parts of the East, apparently in Constantinople itself. But

Rome could not accept it; for it discredited the Council of Chalcedon, and that was to discredit Rome herself, as she especially prided herself upon her pre-eminence there, both in doctrine and in authority. The *Henoticon* therefore did not relieve the situation, but made it still more difficult.

The Emperor Justinian (527–565) also endeavoured to reconcile the Monophysites. At first he adopted severe measures against them, but afterward tried milder ones. He arranged a conference between the Chalcedonian and Monophysite bishops, but could not accomplish anything. He then gave his approval to the Monophysite watchword "*God was crucified,*" which might be orthodox, or not, according as it was explained. He also favoured the *Aphthardocetae,* who also could not be regarded as inconsistent with Chalcedon. The Chalcedonian divines had opposed both of these; but they had no call to do so, as far as the formula of Chalcedon itself was concerned.

The chief measure of Justinian was, however, the condemnation by edict of the "Three Chapters," that is, the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret against Cyril, and of Ibas to Maris. This action was urged by Theodorus of Cæsarea as the best way of reconciling the Monophysites. The divines thus condemned were regarded by the Monophysites as really Nestorians. Theodore's writings were not approved by the Council of Chalcedon; but those of Theodoret and Ibas were not disapproved, although for a while both these divines, with John of Antioch, had been hostile to Cyril. But they had been reconciled before Chalcedon and had agreed to the Chalcedonian formula. Rome hesitated; not that she approved of these three divines, but for fear that their condemnation was another attempt to discredit the Council of Chalcedon. Yet, finally, when the Fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople condemned them, Rome assented. But this action did not succeed with the Monophysites, any more than did the others. The most of the Egyptians separated from the Greek patriarch of Alexandria, chose their own patriarch, and under the name of

the Copts have remained separate till the present day. They associated themselves with the Ethiopian Church, which had always been loosely attached to the Church of the Roman Empire.

§ 4. *The Sixth Ecumenical Council rejected Monotheletism and asserted that Christ had two wills, divine and human, the will being regarded as belonging to a complete nature, and not as belonging to the person.*

Another attempt to reconcile the Monophysites was made by the Emperor Heraclius, under the advice of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, by the assertion that the two natures were united in one will, *μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια.* Sergius received the support of Honorius of Rome, who did not regard the question as important. He was not opposed to either one energy or two. He thought the question a trifling one, fit only for grammarians. However, he was willing to say: "We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ." But there was great opposition to this doctrine all over both East and West. Finally Heraclius, in the interest of peace, issued an edict (638) composed by Sergius, who thought he had the support of Rome. It was called the *ἔκθεσις*, or *Exposition of the Faith,* and it forbade the use of the expressions: *one* or *two operations.*

But the place of Honorius had been taken by another pope, who repudiated the *Ecthesis;* and he was followed generally throughout the Church, partly because the doctrine of a single will seemed another attempt to undermine the Faith of Chalcedon, and partly because of a resentment of imperial authority in matters of faith. The Emperor Constans II tried to enforce the decision of his predecessor by a decree called the *Typos* (648 A. D.), enjoining silence as to the matter in dispute. But the pope the more determinedly opposed it. Martin I, in a Synod at the Lateran (649), anathematised the doctrine of *the one Will* as inconsistent with Chalcedon, and condemned both *Ecthesis* and *Typos.* The controversy continued until the reign of Constantine

Pogonatus. He invited Pope Agatho to give his judgment on the doctrine. This was done in an official letter, communicated to the Sixth Ecumenical Council, at Constantinople (680), which decided for *two Wills*, and condemned Honorius as a heretic. This is the decision:

"For as His flesh is called, and is, the flesh of God the Word; so also the natural will of His flesh is called, and is, the proper (will) of God the Word. . . . For as His most holy and immaculate animated flesh was not destroyed because deified, but continued in its own state and nature; so also His human will, though deified, was not destroyed."

The question whether Christ had two Wills, or one, depends upon whether the will is to be attached to the person or to the nature; if to the former, there can be but one will; if to the latter, two. The definition of the Council is based on the psychological opinion that the wills go with the natures, and are therefore two.

These questions of detail as to the two natures of Christ in the unity of His person are difficult. It cannot be said that they have all been solved. They depend upon various psychological opinions concerning which modern philosophy has much to say, though little of any great value. All of these are open questions, so far as they do not involve a departure from the fundamental Faith of the Church. The statements of the Creeds and the Councils are simple, excluding only the most dangerous errors, and, so far as they are positive, departing but slightly from the explicit teachings of Holy Scripture, and then only in defining their implicit teachings. These statements were made necessarily in the terms of ancient philosophy and psychology. They do not at all stand in the way of Modern Thought; nor do they prevent restatement in terms of modern psychology and philosophy, so long as the Biblical substance and the official historical Faith of the Church is not impaired.

PART II

PARTICULAR SYMBOLICS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Particular Symbolics studies the symbols of the various branches of the Church of Christ in their origin and history, and interprets them apart, by themselves, in the light of their history and their relation to the particular Christian church which produced them.

Particular Symbolics begins with the division of the Church between the East and the West, each of these two great divisions of Christendom going its own independent way from the time of the final separation until the present time. During the Middle Ages the Roman Church produced several important symbols, determining several doctrines, and ruling out several heresies which arose in the West.

During this period the Greek Church adhered to the fundamental symbols of the Church, and made no other symbolic statements.

The great Reformation of the sixteenth century resulted in the separation of the Protestant Churches into three great divisions, the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Anglican. Each of these divisions produced its own particular symbols, and over against them the Roman and Greek Churches issued additional symbols.

These symbols of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries differ from the fundamental symbols of the ancient Church and the particular symbols of the mediæval Western Church,

in that these define certain specific doctrines, in response to the necessities of the time, to overrule and reject certain heresies. Some symbols of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries do this; but the most of them are elaborate treatises of theology. It is quite impracticable to consider adequately the symbols of the Middle Ages in a volume like this. It is also impracticable to do so with the symbols of the particular Churches that have originated since the Reformation, for each one would require a volume by itself. The only thing that is practicable, or indeed important, in this volume is to give the origin and historic importance of each of these symbols under Particular Symbolics, and to presuppose the interpretation of the doctrines of the particular symbols in the comparative study of them under Comparative Symbolics.

CHAPTER II

SYMBOLS OF THE LATIN CHURCH

The Middle Ages began, according to my estimation, with the crowning of Charlemagne, December 25, 800, by Pope Leo III. As in all beginnings, a definite central event is in the midst of a number of minor beginnings shortly before and afterward.

The Middle Ages may be subdivided into three periods: (1) The preparatory one, which ended with the reforming Synod of Sutri, 1046. This introduced (2) the Hildebrandian reform and the German period of the Papacy, the age of Scholastic Theology and Canon Law in their highest development, and of the revivals connected with the great mendicant orders. This period closed with the decline of the papacy and its removal to Avignon, June 5, 1304. (3) The third period begins with the so-called Babylonian captivity of the Church, when it was more or less under the influence of France and was struggling for independence. The whole Church was seething with corruption, in its division under the authority of rival popes. This period, when no supreme authority existed to overcome these evils, came to an end with the overthrow of all the rival popes, the triumph of the papacy over councils and nations, and the reunion of the whole Church under Nicholas V, celebrated by the Jubilee of 1450.

The crowning of Charlemagne by Pope Leo III, as emperor of the western Roman empire, involved the separation of East and West, ecclesiastically as well as politically;

although the final ecclesiastical separation did not take place till some time afterward.

There had been a long struggle between the Patriarchs of Constantinople and the Popes of Rome.

This was due not to jealousy of new Rome on the part of old Rome, or to an eager grasping after authority to which Rome was not entitled, as Protestant writers usually represent, but to the necessity of maintaining the ancient rights of the apostolic see, the foundation of St. Peter and St. Paul as recognised from the most ancient times, and the primacy of St. Peter, given to him by the Saviour and transmitted to his successors in the see of Rome. At least that has always been the doctrine of the Roman Church, as well as of other large sections of the Christian Church from the most ancient times. This was a doctrine, the maintenance of which was a matter of conscience in the Western Church, and of obligation to the Lord and His apostles.

The struggle between Constantinople and Rome had four stages.

(1) The Council of Nice, 325, recognised the four apostolic sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome as supreme in their respective districts. It also gave a place beside them to Constantinople, because it had become the capital of the empire in the East. The primacy of Rome was, however, distinctly stated in the canon law of the Council, although not defined in its nature or extent.

(2) The Council of Constantinople, 381, made the chief bishops of the imperial dioceses supreme over all the ecclesiastical sees in their dioceses. This raised the dignity of Ephesus in Asia and Cæsarea of Cappadocia, but depreciated Jerusalem. It also gave the Patriarch of Constantinople rank next to Rome. This arrangement was never acceptable to Rome, and was not agreeable to the older apostolic sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. Their dissatisfaction, as we have seen, complicated and imbittered the doctrinal controversies which divided these sees.

(3) The Council of Chalcedon, 451, made the situation

worse by reducing the Patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea under the Patriarch of Constantinople, thus greatly increasing his importance by giving him an extent of jurisdiction second only to that of Rome.

(4) The climax was reached when Constantinople intruded into the jurisdiction of Rome, supported by imperial authority, and subordinated Illyria, Macedonia, and Greece to itself.

This conflict of the popes with Constantinople for their primacy and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, both over particular sees and, in a more comprehensive sense, over the whole Christian Church, became involved with disputes over minor doctrinal and institutional questions, whose importance was greatly exaggerated in the heat of controversy. The most important of these was the addition to the Nicene Creed of the *filioque*.

The age-long conflict culminated in the contest between Pope Nicholas and Photius, 861–880, when the two Churches separated. Then came a succession of reunions and separations until the final separation as the result of the conflict between Pope Leo IX and Michael Cærularius in 1053.

The last ecumenical Council recognised by both the Greek and the Roman Church was the Council of Nice in 787. This Council condemned the Iconoclasts and gave sanction to the use of images in worship, distinguishing between the true worship due to God alone (λατρεία) and a secondary worship of veneration and honour in the use of sacred images (προσκύνησις = *adoratio*, later *doulia*). The controversy over the use of images was chiefly in the Greek Church, and, like all controversies over institutions, became exceedingly bitter, especially with the common people, but with only an echo in the West. The decision of the Council, though accepted universally in East and West during the Middle Ages, was productive of so much superstition and so many abuses, that the worship of images became one of

the most important questions of reform in the Age of the Reformation. It was, however, an institutional rather than a doctrinal question.

After the separation the Greek Church remained stationary on the seven ecumenical Councils as to their decisions on both doctrine and institution.

The Roman Church adhered to the doctrinal decisions of these councils, but dissented from those canons that did not come up to the full measure of the papal claims. After the separation the Roman Church continued to hold councils which claimed to be ecumenical though not recognised by the Greek Church. Questions of doctrine and institution were also decided by provincial synods, and by the pope himself, whose consent was regarded as necessary even to give the acts of provincial synods and ecumenical councils validity.

During the Middle Ages there were ten ecumenical Councils recognised by the Western Church but not by the Eastern. In the first period only one was held, that of Constantinople in 869 against Photius in connection with the separation of the Greek Church from the Latin. In the second period there were six Councils: four held in the Lateran at Rome, 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, and two at Lyons, 1245, 1274. In the third period three councils were held: at Vienne, 1311–12; at Constance, 1414–18; at Basel-Ferrara-Florence, 1431–42. The most of these dealt with questions of government and discipline, and so enlarged the Canon Law of the Church. Some of them dealt with schismatics. Only four of them dealt with dogmatic questions: the third Lateran, 1179, with Nihilianism; the fourth Lateran, 1215, with the Eucharist; the second Lyons, 1274, with the procession of the Spirit; and that of Florence, 1439, with matters in dispute with the Greeks and Orientals.

Prior to the first ecumenical Council held in the West there were two general synods, whose decisions were approved by the popes, which would have been regarded as ecumenical if held at a later period, and which have ever

since been regarded by the Western Church as authoritative: (1) the Synod of Frankfort, 794, which decided against Adoptionism; and (2) the Synod of Rome, 1079, which determined the controversy as to the Eucharist.

We shall also have to consider under Particular Symbolics the Synod of Orange of 529, which rejected Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism; for, while this council was held a considerable time before the Middle Ages began, it yet decided a purely Western controversy in which the Greek Church had no part, and its decisions have never been regarded as symbolical by the Greek Church.

§ 1. *The Synod of Orange in* 529 *rejected Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism; and defined a mild Augustinianism. Original sin was defined on its negative rather than on its positive side. The necessity of divine grace was maintained, but the sufficiency of its provision was asserted. The divine sovereignty was recognised, but no absolute decree.*

In the Western Church Pelagianism raised a great controversy by assertions of the innocency of human nature, which contradicted the Pauline doctrine of original sin and guilt and the absolute need of divine grace for salvation. Augustine, the great theologian of the West, undertook the defence of the Pauline doctrine of sin and grace, but pushed his doctrine to an extreme.

Pelagius was condemned with Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus in 431, but without any consideration of the questions at issue. The Eastern Church did not then take, and never since has taken, any interest in these questions. At the same time the Eastern Church has maintained the Biblical position and does not, in fact, differ from the Roman Church on the question. It was a Western controversy.

The errors of Pelagius were rejected by Pope Innocent I and the Synod of Milevius in 416, then more fully in eight canons by the Synod of Carthage in 418, and by Pope Zosimus in his *epistola tractoria,* 418. These official decisions of the Church did not adopt the Augustinian doctrines of sin

and grace in their entirety, but only in general in a mild form, to the exclusion of Pelagian errors.

The chief phases of the doctrine decided were: (1) that Adam became mortal because of his sin and subsequent to his fall; (2) that all infants inherit original sin, and therefore must be baptised in order to receive the grace of salvation; (3) that the divine grace imparts both remission of sin and ability to overcome sin.

The views of Augustine as to sin and grace were pressed to exaggerations by Augustine himself and his disciples, and these were combated by many distinguished theologians, especially in Gaul, who sought an intermediate position, but in doing so really reacted too far in the direction of Pelagianism, so that they have been in modern times called Semi-Pelagians, yet not in strict propriety.

They are more properly called Massilians, because their chief centre was the monastery of Lérins and the sees in the vicinity of Marseilles. These theologians accepted the decisions already made by the Church, but were unwilling to accept other Augustinian positions. They maintained that, notwithstanding original sin, there remained in man a rudiment of good-will and moral ability to co-operate with the divine grace in his salvation; and that all mankind were included in the plan of salvation, the failure being due to man's fault alone.

After a long controversy the most serious questions in dispute were determined by the Synod of Orange, in 529, in favour of a mild Augustinianism. Pelagianism and the errors of the Massilians were condemned, but High Augustinianism was not indorsed.

(1) Original sin was asserted as inherited by the entire posterity of Adam, and as total in soul and body; but its negative side of moral inability, rather than its positive side, was emphasised.

(2) The absolute need of prevenient divine grace was asserted; but also that sufficient grace was imparted in the sacraments of the Church, and it was not regarded as irresistible.

(3) The sovereignty of God was recognised, and the election of grace; but predestination to evil was repudiated.

The positive and essential parts of the decree are the following:

Ac sic secundum supra scriptas sanctarum Scripturarum sententias, vel antiquorum Patrum definitiones, hoc Deo propitiante et prædicare debemus et credere, quod per peccatum primi hominis ita inclinatum et attenuatum fuerit liberum arbitrium, ut nullus postea aut diligere Deum sicut oportuit, aut credere in Deum, aut operari propter Deum quod bonum est, possit, nisi gratia eum et misericordia divina prævenerit. Unde Abel justo, et Noe, et Abraham, et Isaac, et Jacob, et omni antiquorum sanctorum multitudini illam præclaram fidem, quam in ipsorum laude prædicat apostolus Paulus, non per bonum naturae, quod prius in Adam datum fuerat, sed per gratiam Dei credimus fuisse collatam: quam gratiam etiam post adventum Domini omnibus, qui baptizari desiderant, non in libero arbitrio haberi, sed Christi novimus simul et credimus largitate conferri. . . . Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod accepta per baptismum gratia omnes baptizati (Christo auxiliante et cooperante), quae ad salutem pertinent, possint et debeant (si fideliter laborare voluerint) adimplere. Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate prædestinatos esse, non solum non credimus, sed etiam si sunt, qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus. Hoc etiam salubriter profitemur et credimus, quod in omni opere bono non nos incipimus, et postea per Dei misericordiam adjuvamur, sed ipse nobis nullis præcedentibus bonis meritis et fidem et amorem sui prius inspirat, ut et baptismi sacramenta fideliter requiramus, et post baptismum (cum ipsius adjutorio) ea, quae sibi sunt placita, implere possimus (Canon 25).

These statements of the Synod of Orange are the official doctrine of the Church by which all doctrines of sin and grace are to be tested. Those who make the theology of Augustine the test, exalt him above the Church, make his opinions more important than official symbolic decisions, and neglect to make the proper distinctions between private theory and public doctrine.

This mild Augustinianism was commonly held in the Church until the Reformation; although there were occasional conflicts with those who reproduced the High Augustinianism of Augustine himself. This could hardly be otherwise, because of the veneration for Augustine and his

writings as the great doctor of the Western Church. Nevertheless, though High Augustinianism persisted and constantly reappeared in scholars here and there, it was always discredited until the Reformation, when High Augustinianism was revived by the Reformers over against the mild Augustinianism of the Catholic Church. This involved conflicts still more serious than those of the sixth century, which have continued to disturb the Church until the present time. If only the Reformers had been content with the decisions of the Synod of Orange, a multitude of evils would have been averted. This will have to be considered more fully in our study of the Confessions of Faith of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

§ 2. *The Synod of Frankfort, 794, rejected the Adoptionists, who held that Christ, as the Second Person of the Trinity, was the natural Son of God, but as the Son of Mary was the adopted Son, refusing this distinction as tending toward Nestorianism.*

The Adoptionist controversy is usually discussed as a reflection of the Monophysite controversies. But in fact it was purely a Western question. Adoptionism arose in Spain in antithesis to a phase of Sabellianism, which was taught by Migetius. At the provincial Synod of Seville, 782, he was condemned. But Elipandus incautiously went to the other extreme, and distinguished between the two natures of Christ so sharply that he regarded the Son of Mary as only the adopted Son of God, and as such to be distinguished from the Second Person of the Trinity, the natural Son.

The opinion of Elipandus was taken up by a number of Spanish bishops, and especially by Felix, Bishop of Urgel, in Gaul, who brought it to the attention of the theologians of the court of Charlemagne and before the Pope.

These Adoptionists refused the charge of Nestorianism, and denied that they taught two distinct Persons in Christ: but it is difficult to see how they could avoid this logical implication; especially as Felix claimed that Christ as the adopted Son of God was only nominally, not really, God, and

that as servant of God He had not authority over His own life, but was subject to death and needed Himself redemption as other men.

Schwane well says: "The Adoptionists stand in the same relation to Nestorians, that the Monothelites do to the Monophysites." *

The least we can say about them is that they emphasised the separation of the two natures of Christ in a perilous way, with implications that were certainly contrary to the Christology of Chalcedon.

The Adoptionists were attacked by many divines in Spain and Gaul, the chief of whom was the learned Alcuin, the great theologian of the court of Charlemagne. Several synods pronounced against them, the most important of which was the Synod of Frankfort, 794, presided over by the legates of the Pope, and composed of representative bishops from all parts of the Western Church. At a later date it would have been regarded as ecumenical: but at this time, before the separation of East and West, it could not be so regarded; for the East was absent, and the question was purely a Western one. Adoptionism was rejected as heretical, and the Faith of the Church was thus stated:

"With the heart we believe unto righteousness, but with the mouth confess unto salvation: that our Lord Jesus Christ is true Son of God, not putative, proper in both natures, not adoptive, equal and coeternal with the Father and Holy Spirit." †

§ 3. *The Synod of Rome, in* 1079, *defined the doctrine of the Eucharist in a confession of faith required of Berengarius. The real presence was asserted by way of a conversion of the elements into the body and blood of the Lord, and the symbolical as well as the Capernaitical theories were rejected.*

The most important doctrinal decision of the Church in the Middle Ages was that of the Synod of Rome, in 1079, approved by the Pope, respecting the Eucharist.

This question was raised by certain extravagant state-

* *Dogmengeschichte*, III, p. 228. † *V.* Schwane, III, p. 239.

ments of Radbertus Paschasius, a monk of Corbie, in Gaul (831–3), which were controverted by an anonymous writing, *de corpore et sanguine Domini* (875–7), usually attributed to Ratramnus, also a monk of the same order, but by the Synod of Vercelli in 1050, by Schwane and others, to John Scotus Erigena, who in any case agreed with it. This conflict did not, however, result in a dogmatic definition by the Church.

The discussion was renewed by Berengarius of Tours, who wrote a letter to Lanfranc, a monk of Bec (1050), sustaining Erigena's views as he thought, but really expanding them to the length of heresy. He was condemned through the influence of Lanfranc, at first at Rome and Vercelli in 1050, then at Florence in 1055, at Rome in 1059, and by Gregory VII in two Councils at Rome (1078–9), when he was compelled to subscribe to an orthodox profession of Faith, which thus became symbolical.*

"Ego Berengarius corde credo et ore confiteor, panem et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri et post consecrationem esse verum Christi corpus, quod natum est de Virgine et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pependit, et quod sedet ad dexteram Patris, et verum sanguinem Christi, qui de latere ejus effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti, sed in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae."

This Confession of Faith asserts positively (1) that the body of Christ present in the Eucharist is the identical body that was born of the Virgin, crucified as a sacrifice for the salvation of the world, and enthroned at the right hand of the Father; (2) that the blood of Christ of the Eucharist is the same blood as that which flowed from the side of the Crucified; (3) that the substance of the bread and wine placed upon the altar was converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ; (4) that this conversion was made by means of the words of institution of the Redeemer pronounced by the priest at the time of consecration.

* *V.* Denzinger, p. 105.

This confession also rejects negatively the two extreme opinions: (1) the symbolical theory, that the body and blood of Christ are present only by sign and by virtue of the sacrament, asserting that they are present by property of nature and truth of substance; (2) the gross theory, that the eucharistic body is the flesh and blood offered on the cross with its carnal and physical properties, which is cannibalistic. On the other hand, the confession asserts that it is the identical body of Christ, which persists in all the changes from the birth of the Virgin to the heavenly reign; and so independent of carnal and earthly properties and conditions.

This definition of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist continued to be the consensus of the Church until the Lateran Council of 1215, when, over against the Albigenses, who had adopted the symbolical theory, the Council asserted the real substantial presence in terms of the scholastic philosophy.

"Una vero est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos est sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina; ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui rite fuerit ordinatus, secundum claves Ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit Apostolis eorumque successoribus Jesus Christus."

This definition does not differ from the previous one, except in terminology and in putting the Eucharist in its relation to the Church and the priesthood of the Church.

(1) The term *transubstantiation* takes the place of *conversion;* and the doctrine is, that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, their substance having been made over by the divine power into His substance.

(2) The substance of the bread and wine no longer remain in the Eucharist, but only their *species;* that is, those qualities that they have, which appeal to our senses. The senses

perceive bread and wine; but faith sees the body and blood of Christ.

(3) Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice in the Church, offering Himself in the Eucharist as the one great sacrifice to God for the one Church.

(4) No one but a priest rightly ordained according to Christ's institution, with the keys of the Church, can celebrate the Eucharist.

These definitions of the Roman Councils only outline the Faith of the Church, which was filled up by the consensus of the great Scholastics.

The Scholastic terminology of transubstantiation, substance, and species, depends upon the Aristotelian philosophy, which the Scholastics used for their definitions. The doctrine which underlies this terminology does not depend upon the terminology; especially as the doctrine was formulated prior to its use. Therefore the Council of Trent, when this terminology was challenged in the sixteenth century, did not defend it as essential, but only as suitable and proper, when they said:

"By the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; *which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.*" (13[4].)

This definition asserts the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, in that the Eucharist is His sacrifice. He offers it as priest; and He is the sacrifice which He offers. The priests of the Church minister in His name, by His authority, and as His representatives. They have no authority over Him, His priesthood, or sacrifice. He has the supreme authority over them, and they are simply His agents. The definition simply asserts that the Eucharist is Christ's sacrifice. It does not define the nature or kind of the sacrifice. The definition of nature and kind made by the theologians brought on the controversies of the sixteenth

century. But the Mediæval Church itself was not responsible for more than it defined, and the consensus it had reached on this subject.

§ 4. *The Council of the Lateran,* 1179, *condemned Nihilianism, which regarded the human nature of Christ as having only a phenomenal, and no substantial, existence.*

The mediæval theologians, in their use of dialectics for the explanation of the mysteries of theology, involved themselves at times in serious errors as regards both the Trinity and the Person of Christ. It was especially Abelard who fell into error as to the Trinity, and was condemned by the Council of Sens in 1141. The great Scholastic Peter Lombard originated a new heresy as to the Person of Christ. He proposed three different explanations of the mystery of the Incarnation, the last of which was that the Logos assumed human nature, body and soul, merely as a garment. The Logos clothed Himself with manhood, without involving any change in Himself. He was not made anything that He was not before; and so this theory was called *Nihilianism.* This view was not definitely adopted by the Lombard, and did not become the basis for an heretical party; but as it was proposed in a text-book almost universally used, it was necessary for the Church to condemn it. This was done at a Synod in Tours, 1163, and finally by Pope Alexander III and the Lateran Council, in 1179. The proposition anathematised was that *Christus non est aliquid secundum quod homo.*

This conception of the Incarnation made it nothing more than theophanic. The human nature was not real humanity, and therefore Christ did not identify Himself with mankind. His union with mankind was not organic. He did not save human nature from within, but from without. This theory not only threatened the doctrine of the Incarnation but also that of human salvation.

§ 5. *The Western Church attached "and the Son" to the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father. This*

crept into the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds without authority, and it was resented by the Greek Church. After centuries of conflict the Western Church defined the doctrine at the Council of Lyons, 1274, *as a single spiration of Father and Son. It was still further defined at the Council of Florence,* 1439, *as not inconsistent with the Greek formula: from the Father through the Son.*

The doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father probably came first into the Athanasian Creed, then from that into the Nicene Creed in the sixth century.* So soon as the Greeks became aware of it, they objected to it as an unauthorised addition to the Creed. But the controversy on this subject did not become acute until the conflict between Pope Nicholas and Photius in the ninth century, when it was, as it has ever since remained, the great doctrinal dispute between the Greeks and Romans; although, in fact, the difference has been magnified far beyond its intrinsic merits, for the real difference is not so great after all.†

We have to distinguish between the temporal and the eternal mission of the divine Spirit. There is no difference as to the temporal mission but only as to the eternal mission. The Greeks recognise the mission of the Spirit *through* the Son, but insist that the Father alone, as root and fountain of deity, sends forth the Spirit originally.

The Council of Lyons, in 1274, tried to overcome the difference by the following definition:

Fideli ac devota professione fatemur, quod Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit.

The Council of Florence, 1439, recognises that there is no real difference between the Greek and the Roman formula:

"Quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio aeternaliter est, et essentiam suam suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul et Filio, et ex utroque

* *V.* p. 98. † *V.* Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith,* pp. 257 *seq.*

aeternaliter tamquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit; declarantes, quod id, quod sancti doctores et patres dicunt, ex Patre per Filium procedere Spiritum Sanctum, ad hanc intelligentiam tendit."

§ 6. *The Anselmic doctrine of the Atonement was generally accepted by the Mediæval Church in its main features, but without any official determination of the doctrine.*

It is a remarkable fact that the great characteristic doctrine of the Middle Ages, the atonement wrought upon the cross, especially as formulated by Anselm († 1109), Bernard († 1153), Thomas Aquinas († 1274), and Bonaventura († 1274), the four great doctors of the Church, did not receive the official definition of the Church. It is not surprising, therefore, that the many problems connected therewith came down to the Reformation unsolved, although there was a general consensus in the doctrine as stated by Anselm. This doctrine played an important part, not only in the time of the Reformation, but also in the seventeenth century, in the Confessions of Faith.

The Incarnation was considered, in the ancient Church more especially, with reference to the assumption of human nature in order to redeem it. And salvation was attached in the Creeds to the several great acts of Christ from His Incarnation unto His Advent. Various circumstances in the Middle Ages led to an emphasis upon the death of Christ upon the cross as the chief purpose of the Incarnation. This emphasis was due to the Augustinian emphasis upon the Pauline doctrine of sin and grace, and the necessity therein involved of Christologising the doctrine of sin. This was done chiefly by Anselm, who first gave shape to the doctrine of the atonement. He asks the question: *Cur deus homo?* and answers it by saying, that the Incarnation was the voluntary act of the Son of God in order to die upon the cross, that He might thereby satisfy the divine Majesty and merit the divine grace on behalf of the sinful world.

The emphasis upon the divine sovereignty in the teaching of the Church since Augustine, and the exaggeration of the conception of majesty in the feudal system, furnished

Anselm the mould for his doctrine. Sin was essentially an offence against the divine Majesty, which involved the penalty of death. The sinner must either suffer the penalty himself, or render adequate satisfaction to God.

No man could do this. Therefore it was necessary that the Son of God should become man by incarnation.

He alone could render adequate satisfaction for the sins of the world, and merit the divine grace for mankind; because He alone needed nothing for Himself, and by the union of divinity with His humanity His satisfaction and His merit were made of infinite worth.

This view of Anselm is mingled with peculiarities which have not persisted in theology; especially his opinion that the salvation of mankind was to supply the place of the fallen angels, in which the honour of God was involved.

In the older inadequate conceptions of the atonement it had been the common opinion that the devil had a claim upon the sinner, and that he had to be satisfied by some kind of compensation.

St. Bernard held this view, and battled for it against Abelard. But Anselm rightly avoided this opinion, and urged that it was the divine Majesty that was offended, and that must be satisfied. Later theologians narrowed the conception by substituting the divine justice for the divine Majesty, but this was a great and serious mistake.

St. Bernard also makes the mistake of putting the divine attributes in antithesis in the matter of salvation. He graphically represents the divine attributes as pleading before the divine Majesty. Justice and Truth demand the death of the sinner. Mercy and Peace urge his forgiveness. The Incarnation of the Son of God reconciles the divine attributes; because it satisfies the claims of Justice and Truth, and secures the forgiveness of sinners in accordance with the pleas of Mercy and Peace. Such an antithesis is poetic and mystic. It graphically shows the difficulties in the way of an atonement in the mind of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but it is not sound theology.

Anselm represents that the way of the cross was the only possible way of salvation. But this seemed to Thomas Aquinas and still more to Duns Scotus an encroachment upon the divine freedom. We may say that it was the best way because chosen by the divine love and wisdom, but not that it was the only possible way. In fact, though Anselm asserts the voluntariness of the sacrifice of Christ, that goes into the background of his thought. It is the divine majesty and honour that so fill his mind, that everything must be explained in their interest.

The Anselmic doctrine of the atonement, especially in the form given it by Thomas Aquinas, became the common property of the Church in all essential particulars, and was adopted by the Protestant world at the Reformation as well as by the Roman Catholic. About the year 1190 a Greek theologian, Nicolaus of Methone, stated a doctrine of the atonement essentially the same as Anselm's.* Undoubtedly Protestantism gave the Anselmic doctrine a new shaping in connection with the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and in so far departed from the more general and less definite doctrine which the Roman Catholic Church still maintained. But both stand alike on the same general principle of the doctrine of Anselm, which was not questioned until the conflict with the Socinians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when several different theories of the atonement emerged, which continue in the field of theological discussion until the present day.

The Anselmic doctrine exaggerates the work of the cross, and does not sufficiently estimate the work of the risen and glorified Redeemer as the heavenly Priest and King; so that these essential parts of the redemptive work of Christ have remained in the background until the present day, and the full proportion of salvation as outlined in the primitive Creeds has commonly not been understood. This exaggeration also reacted upon the doctrine of the Eucharist in

* *V.* Ullmann, *Die Dogmatik in der griech. Kirche, sæc.* 12. *Stud. und Krit.* 1833; Dorner, I. A., *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, II, *s.* 549.

an undue emphasis upon the death of Christ and expiation in connection with the sacrifice, all of which made trouble at the Reformation and subsequently.

The Anselmic doctrine of the atonement, so far as it became universal as the consensus of the Church, may be thus defined:

(1) Christ, the Son of God, by His incarnation as the God-man, rendered to God by His death on the cross the satisfaction that the divine Majesty required for all mankind.

(2) Christ, by His full obedience and voluntary self-sacrificing love, won infinite merit for His Church.

§ 7. *One may say that the chief work of the Middle Ages was the unfolding of the doctrine of the Church and its institutions, and yet no symbolical definition was made of the doctrine of the Church.*

The doctrine of the Church underlies that of the sacraments. The doctrine of the sacraments is simply the unfolding of the doctrine of the Church; for the sacraments are her sacraments, and the grace that they convey is the grace committed to her by Jesus Christ Himself. The chief work of the Middle Ages, indeed, was the building up of the Church as an organisation, her ministry, sacraments, and other sacred things; and yet there was not, during the Middle Ages, any symbolical definition of the Church by Council or Synod. This was due to the following reason. The doctrine of the Church was stated in the two ancient Creeds, the Apostles' and the Nicene, in connection with the Holy Spirit as *one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church.* The Mediæval Church found no occasion to go beyond that, save to claim that the Western Roman Church was that Church. It was implied that the Church was Christ's own, and no one questioned this. The only question that was raised, was as to the *holy* Church; whether it could include the unholy and unfaithful, and whether it was proper to separate from such a mixed Church, and organise separate Churches of the saints. Such attempts were made from time to time in the

ancient and mediæval, as in the modern age. One sect after another arose with this ideal of a holy Church in mind, which they strove in vain to realise. The Christian Church has always opposed these schisms by appealing to the necessity of unity, catholicity, and apostolicity, as well as of holiness. And it has further appealed to the Pauline doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ, the bride of Christ, the kingdom of Christ; all of which demand unity, and are altogether inconsistent with schism.

The great Scholastics of the Middle Ages emphasised the doctrine of the Church, the ministry, and sacraments; and elaborated them into minute details, which sometimes led far away from Christ in the emphasis upon the external authority of the hierarchy and the objective use of the sacred institutions of the Church. At the same time they did not forget or overlook the fundamental Biblical doctrine of the Church.

We may indeed define a consensus on this subject so far as the relation of the Church to Christ is concerned, which was not questioned, but adhered to by all parties in the sixteenth century except the Anabaptist sects, which simply revived the older schismatic movements in behalf of a holy separated Church. All agreed to the Biblical doctrine:

(1) That Christ is the head of His body, the Church.

(2) That the Church is the bride of Christ.

(3) That the Church is His kingdom.

(4) That the Church is the administrator of His salvation, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

(5) That unto the Church Christ has given the ministry with the authority of the keys.

(6) That Christ's own presence is in and with the Church from the beginning until the consummation of the world.

(7) That Christ, as Prophet, Priest, and King, is the head of a royal priesthood with a mediating priesthood, representing both Christ and the Church.

(8) That Christ is the one sacrificial victim, at once on the altar-table of the Church and on the heavenly altar.

These two great doctrines of the atonement and the Church, which attained no symbolic determination by the Church of the Middle Ages, and which yet attained well-nigh universal consent, suggest two important lessons.

(1) It needs no symbolic definition of a doctrine to win the consensus of the Church to it. Consensus may be best attained by general discussion, without the heat of controversy generated by charges of heresy, ecclesiastical discipline, and authoritative decisions.

(2) On the other hand, while there was general consent to these doctrines in the items mentioned above, there were still open many difficult questions that troubled the Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It might be said that, if the Church had decided these questions symbolically during the Middle Ages, even at the cost that such decisions always involve, it might have saved the Church from the still more serious evils of later controversies and divisions.

The Middle Ages closed from a political point of view with the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, 1453. But so far as the Church and theology are concerned, it closed with the Council of Florence in 1442. At this Council several Oriental Churches were brought into the scheme of union, and the degrees of union of that Council have been the basis of all the relations of Rome to the Eastern Churches until the present day. At that same Council the relation of popes to councils was determined, which question had been in dispute for a long time in the controversies of the Popes with the Councils of Constance and Basel, whose antipapal decrees were rejected by the Popes.

The schism in the Western Church and the conflict between rival popes was brought to an end by the irenic measures of Nicholas V in 1449–50, the latter being a Jubilee year in which was celebrated the reunion of the entire Christian world under the Pope.

The rejoicings of the Jubilee year were well founded but superficial. The reunion with the Greek and Oriental

Churches was only apparently and not really consummated, and soon resulted in the schism of fragments from these Churches to Rome, leaving the main bodies even more hostile to the papacy than ever before.

The questions in dispute in Western Christendom were decided in favour of papal prerogative, but in other respects were not settled at all, and a profound discontent with the decision was felt all over Europe. The decisions of the Council of Florence and the irenic attitude of Pope Nicholas really prepared the way for the Reformation by making it impossible to reform the Church in any other way than by papal initiative or by revolution. This was now the only alternative. Therefore so soon as Popes of a different character ascended the papal throne, reformation by revolution became inevitable.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN OF THE REFORMATION

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was a widespread movement in Western Europe. It had been prepared for by many reforming movements in the previous centuries, which had all failed in removing the evils complained of, and had rather increased them. This reform succeeded because of the birth of certain great principles, which not only removed evils but solved essential problems of Christian life and thought. The evils complained of were multitudinous, and many reformers appeared with many different plans of reform. The Reformation worked itself out simultaneously in the different countries of Western Europe, assuming different forms in the different nations, resulting in the organisation of national Churches with national types of Christianity.

§ 1. *The evils in the Church from which Western Europe suffered were comprehensive and all-pervading in character. They were civil, social, and economic more than religious, doctrinal, and ethical. They were rooted in the absolute despotism of the Pope and the greed, arrogance, and tyranny of the Roman Curia.*

In the civil sphere the Popes had become absolute monarchs of a dominion known as the States of the Church, comprehending a good part of central Italy.

The interests of Church and State were so entwined at Rome that they could not be separated in practice, even if they could be distinguished in theory. The inevitable consequence was that the Pope was constantly injuring the civil

interests of all other States in the interests of his own State. Civil and religious interests were constantly in conflict in the mind of the Pope himself, and not infrequently the civil prevailed. The authority of the Pope, which was universally recognised as supreme in the Church, had gradually intruded into the prerogative of the State; so that the Pope was a perpetual troubler to all nations. The Popes claimed jurisdiction over all ecclesiastical persons and all ecclesiastical property, as well as over all ecclesiastical relations of all people, from the king on his throne to the peasant in his humble abode.

There were constant conflicts between the papal court and all other courts of Europe. The only possible way of getting on was by treaties or concordats between the Popes and the monarchs, making temporary settlements of the questions in dispute.

(1) The Popes were almost always at war with one nation or another; and a large part of their work was in making alliances to balance one nation over against another. This made Italy the battle-ground of Europe, resulting in crushing for centuries the Italian national aspirations, and in widespread demoralisation in all spheres of life. A fearful retribution fell upon Pope Clement VII in 1527, when the troops of Charles V captured Rome, and it suffered the worst sack in its history. Even the Pope had to submit to cruel indignities.

(2) There was constant trouble between the Church and the State, because ecclesiastics, especially mendicant monks, when caught in criminal or any illegal acts, were at once taken out of the jurisdiction of civil courts and taken under the protection of ecclesiastical courts. The whole body of ecclesiastics were subjects of the Pope, and not subject to the civil law. This conflict of jurisdiction often brought about intolerable situations in which the civil authorities had to run the risk of sacrilege, with its ecclesiastical penalties, for the sake of their king and country.

(3) It is probable that economic questions were the most

troublesome of all. The political and ecclesiastical state at Rome could only be maintained by the support of the whole Christian world. It was but fair and right that all Christian people should pay a fair share of tax for the support of the central Church government of the Pope. But when the Pope and his cardinals lived in luxury and extravagance greater than that of any monarch, and when the revenues derived from the nations went in large measure to sustain the armies of the Pope, waging war at times on the very nations from which the revenues were received, the iniquity of the system became evident and intolerable.

John XXII (1316–34) established for the first time the oppressive machinery of papal taxation of the nations.

(*a*) The Pope claimed a *tithe* of all ecclesiastical incomes, whenever he needed it for his own purposes. These were originally given only on special occasions, for the Crusades or other special purposes; but the occasions were so multiplied that this claim became a standing oppression, frequently resisted, in spite of excommunication, by clergy and people.

(*b*) The *Annates* (*fructus primi anni*), or First-fruits. From the thirteenth century onward the incumbent had to pay his first year's income for repairs and the sustenance of the heirs of his predecessor. John XXII began to appropriate this for the papacy. At the time of the Reformation it was generally claimed by the Pope.

(*c*) *Procurations* were charges for the personal expenses of bishops and archdeacons in their tours of visitation. The Popes began by demanding a share, and then often claimed the whole.

(*d*) Pope John XXII was the first to demand the income of vacant benefices. It became a great temptation to keep them vacant.

(*e*) The Popes also claimed the right of demanding special payments or subsidies from the clergy, when they needed funds.

(*f*) Besides these sources of income from the nations, every ecclesiastical process was conducted through an inter-

minable series of courts, and with an endless amount of technicality, every step requiring fees. This made litigation of great profit to the Roman courts. With it went the temptation to remove every case possible from local and national courts to Rome.

(*g*) When to all these exactions was added the sale of indulgences to the common people by ecclesiastical peddlers, there is little wonder that for economic reasons, if for no other, all Europe was ready to rebel against the tyranny of Rome.

Luther describes the court of Rome as a place *where vows are annulled; where the monk gets leave to quit his order; where priests can enter the married life for money; where bastards can become legitimate; and dishonour and shame may arrive at high honours; and all evil repute and disgrace is knighted and ennobled. . . . There is a buying and a selling, a changing, blustering and bargaining, cheating and lying, robbing and stealing, debauchery and villany, and all kinds of contempt of God, that Antichrist himself could not rule worse.* (*To the Christian Nobility.*)

As much, and in some respects more, was said by Erasmus, and many others before him, in a witty, satirical, and sarcastic way; but not in such violent and unqualified language.

§ 2. *It was not so much the official religion and doctrine of the Church as the traditional and vulgar errors and superstitions which were at fault. To these were added the exaggerations of the Scholastic Theology and the Canon Law, which in their elaborations had no official consent from the Church.*

The religious and doctrinal evils were also very great. These were due in large measure to ignorance and superstition, and to the frivolity and immorality of the clergy, secular and regular. The higher clergy were usually taken from the higher classes of the people or the nobility, and that not from religious motives but from mercenary motives, in order to secure the income of the chief benefices for the younger sons or relatives of princely families. It is not surprising

under such circumstances that so large a proportion of the higher clergy should be no better, if not worse, in character than the nobles whose company they kept.

The lower secular clergy were chiefly peasants and shared with the peasants their ignorance and superstition. They on the average knew little more than the common usages of the church, sufficient for them to perform the necessary ceremonies of the Catholic religion. The people usually preferred the ministrations of the regulars, whenever they could secure them, because these averaged a much higher grade of character, knowledge, and ability.

But even the regulars had become, in too many quarters, lazy, ignorant, and corrupt. They, also, were largely recruited from the lowest classes, and especially from boys given by their poor or vicious parents to the monasteries to save the expense of their maintenance. A large proportion of them, at that time, grew up into the monastic life without any real call to it, and without the religious character adapted to it.

On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that the orders were the refuge of the greater part of the most devout and noble-minded men of the age. It was indeed chiefly the religious orders that gave the reformers who led in the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

The ignorance and superstition of the clergy had warped and misrepresented to themselves and to the people the doctrines and institutions of the Church. It was not the official religion and doctrine of the Church that the reformers at first attacked so much as the popular, traditional, and common teaching of the Church. They proposed to defend the Church against errors and abuses that had crept into it.

The monastic ideal of religion had become the ideal for the entire ministry and also for Christendom as a whole. The members of religious orders were the regular clergy, the parish priests were the secular; although they also made the same vows of obedience and chastity as the regulars, and only differed from them by not being obliged to the vow of poverty and the conventual life. So far as the vow of

poverty is concerned, there can be no doubt that the regulars in their convents lived a much more comfortable life than the parish priests in the midst of their peasant flocks. As for those people that did not belong to the clergy, and had not attached themselves to the orders as lay brethren or sisters, they were regarded as entirely dependent upon the ministrations of the religious for their salvation. Thus the monastic ideal, pressed as it was into exaggerations even by the earlier reformers like Savonarola, overlooked the basal Biblical and early Christian doctrine that the Church as an organism was a kingdom of priests, and that there could not therefore be any such gulf between the clergy and the people as the common religion of the closing Middle Ages presupposed.

The monastic ideal of Christianity, worked out on the principles of the Counsels of Perfection, while theoretically making the ancient Christian distinction between good works required by Law and voluntary good works of a higher order leading on to Christian perfection, yet in practice did away with the distinction so soon as these Counsels were undertaken in the form of vows, which then required the most implicit obedience under the severest ecclesiastical penalties. Obedience to superiors became the greatest Christian virtue, to the destruction of freedom of conscience and liberty of thought and action. The norm of thinking and of conduct for the individual, the family, the society, the nation, was not the conscience, or the Bible, or even the Church in its official teaching and institutions, but the ecclesiastical superior, and in its last analysis what the Pope thought and what the Pope commanded; and so the law of the Pope assumed the place of the Law of God; and ecclesiastical works, after the monastic ideal, displaced the good works that Jesus taught and the early Christians practised.

Christian Theology had become a vast system of Scholasticism, with hair-splitting distinctions and subtleties, which transcended those of the ancient Jewish Pharisees in the time of Jesus. The charge that Jesus made against

them in Mt. 23, in His series of Woes, fits almost exactly the lawyers and scribes of the Church at the close of the fifteenth century. It is undoubtedly true that they made void the Word of God by their traditions. They buried the Gospel under a mass of speculation. Aristotle was the master rather than Christ.

However, the Scholastic Theology had not as yet become the official doctrine of the Church. It had not been taken up into any Creed, or Confession, or Articles of Religion, or decrees of Councils or Popes. The official teachings of the Church were much more limited than those of Catholic or Protestant Confessions of the sixteenth century; and there was greater liberty of thought before the Reformation than after it, so long as that liberty did not come into conflict with the authorities of the Church.

Häusser well says, speaking of the Council of Trent:

"The great achievement of the Council for the unity of the Catholic Church was this: it formed into a code of laws, on one consistent principle, that which in ancient times had been variable and uncertain, and which had been almost lost sight of in the last great revolution. Controverted questions were replaced by dogmas, doubtful traditions by definite doctrines; a uniformity was established in matters of faith and discipline which had never existed before, and an impregnable bulwark was thus erected against the sectarian spirit and the tendency to innovation."—(*Period of the Reformation*, p. 263.)

That which is true of the Council of Trent is true also of the Confessions of all the Churches of the Reformation. They, one and all, restricted the liberty and variety of opinion and practice, which had existed on the questions at issue, before they were officially decided by the different Churches in two or more different ways.

At the same time, then as ever, in the Christian Church, it was not so much the official theology as the current common opinion of the authorities of the Church which determined orthodoxy or heterodoxy; and it was just this common opinion, which dominated especially the monastic orders,

and made them the heresy hunters of the Church. It was temerity to question this common opinion, as is evident in the experience of Erasmus, Reuchlin, Staupitz, and a multitude of others who did not separate from Rome, as well as of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and other Protestant Reformers.

The Scholastic Theology, however, had a double side. On the one side it was the Theology of the learned, the authorities of the Church. But on the other side it was the Theology of the mass of ignorant and bigoted priests and monks. These accepted it without the ability to understand it or explain it; and so they warped it into all kinds of exaggerated, grotesque, and absurd forms, which they imposed upon the mass of the people as the orthodoxy of the Church. It was chiefly this exaggerated and grotesque Theology with which the reformers first came into conflict, and which they could easily show was not the real teaching of the Church.

But it soon became evident that they could not overthrow these errors without striking at their roots in the false principles of the Scholastic Theology, which were maintained by many of the chief dignitaries of the Church. Thus before they knew it the reformers came into conflict with Scholasticism itself and with the Canon Law; and they very soon, in this conflict, divided among themselves: and so the Reformation was split up into a number of warring systems of Theology, finally expressed in a number of different dogmatic treatises and Confessions of Faith. Instead of unity in the Faith the Reformation brought about the greatest dogmatic confusion and contention in Christian history.

§ 3. *The great work of reform was to throw off the papal tyranny, the monastic rule, the Scholastic Theology, and the Canon Law, and to substitute for them the pure Gospel in such a form as to solve the religious problems of the age.*

The work of religious reform had been undertaken before the great Reformation by devout men in several different countries, resulting in the formation of heretical and schismatic sects. The chief of these were the leaders of the

Waldensians in France and Savoy, Wycklif in England, and Huss in Bohemia. These, in a deep religious interest, struck at the chief evils in the Church: but they did not attain to a solution of the deepest problems of the age; and so they were thrown aside with the schismatic movements that they initiated. They only succeeded in committing the Church in official decrees against their chief errors. These decrees stood in the way of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and were a great hinderance to the work of reform. Thus a decree was issued against John Wycklif by the Council of Constance and in the Bull of Martin V (1418), and he was charged with forty-five heretical statements. So thirty articles of John Huss were condemned at the same time. Many of these articles anticipate the Protestant Reformation; but others are not in accord with Protestantism. There can be no doubt that the condemnation of these articles by Pope and Council greatly obstructed the Reformation. In the debate of Luther with Eck at Leipzig, Luther was greatly compromised, and in the general opinion defeated, because he was compelled to admit that Huss had in some things been unjustly condemned.

Determined efforts for reform were made at the Councils of Pisa, 1409, Constance, 1414–18, and Basel, 1431–43; but these Councils concerned themselves chiefly with the externals of religion, and were not influenced by any deep religious impulse: therefore they succeeded only in part. They overcame the papal schism and removed some of the more glaring evils. But the Church remained unreformed. At the Council of Florence, 1439, the papacy made an important gain in the adoption of a decree of union with the Greeks, Armenians, and Jacobites. The Council of Basel was discredited and dissolved without accomplishing anything. Pius II in a Bull (1459) prohibited an appeal from a Pope to a general Council, and asserted the supreme authority of the Pope as the vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter. The reforming Councils thus only succeeded in condemning Wycklif and Huss, and in invoking a papal

decree, which prevented any of their successors from overruling the Pope.

Luther, in his appeal *to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (1520), stated very clearly the serious obstructions in the way of reform:

"The Romanists, with great dexterity, have drawn around them three walls, with which they have hitherto protected themselves so that no one could possibly reform them; and thus the whole of Christendom is grievously prostrate. *First*, when pressed with the secular power, they have taken the position and declared that the secular authority has no right over them; but that, on the contrary, the spiritual is above the secular. *Secondly*, when any one would rebuke them with the Holy Scripture, they have replied that it belongs to nobody but the Pope to interpret the Scripture. *Thirdly*, if threatened with a Council, they have feigned that no one but the Pope can call a Council."

This, though in somewhat stronger language than necessary, is yet essentially a presentation of the situation as it was at the close of the fifteenth century, and as it is to-day in the Roman Catholic Church. No one but the Pope can reform the Church. Unless he can be influenced to make the reforms, they cannot be made.

None of the reforming movements of the fifteenth century succeeded, because they did not go to the root of the matter. They did not discern the remedy for the evils. They did not discern the principle which was to dominate the new age of the world. The time had not yet come for the advance to be made. The new age had to be born. The fifteenth century was a period of seething preparation. The birth throes became more and more violent as the century drew to its close.

There were many great events that took place in the last half of the fifteenth century, which changed the face of the world. Among these we may mention the capture of Constantinople by the Turks (1453), the invention of printing (1456), and the discovery of America (1492).

The invention of printing enabled the reformers to print

their plans of reform, and secure the attention of multitudes all over Europe. What an enormous change from the limitations imposed upon speech, both as to the number of hearers and the distances to be reached! The advance of the Turks against the Greek empire, resulting in the capture of Constantinople, not only filled Western Europe with multitudes of refugees of another form of religion, but these brought with them the Greek language and Greek literature. This strengthened the Renaissance, or rebirth of ancient learning. It brought Western Europe into touch not only with classic heathen literature, but with primitive Christian literature. It made the Latin Church once more acquainted with the Greek and Oriental, as is evident in the reunion movement at Florence. It made it possible to understand the Greek Fathers, and above all to go back of the Latin Vulgate to the Greek Bible. The publication of the Greek and Hebrew Bibles, and of the Greek and Latin Fathers, was indispensable for the work of Reformation. Without them, how could any one have been able to test the Scholastic theologians and the Canon Law by primitive Christianity and the Fathers of the Church?

The Renaissance was furthermore connected with a revival of the Platonic and Neo-Platonic philosophy; and so Aristotle, the master of the Scholastic philosophy, was undermined by Plato.

Still more the Renaissance worked mightily against the monastic ideals. It brought into prominence the ancient Greek and Roman ideals of life. The æsthetic side of human nature was revived over against the ascetic. The monastic trampling upon human nature gave place to the exaltation of human nature. The reaction went so far, especially in Italy and at Rome, that not a few scholars were essentially heathen with only a varnish of Christian conformity. But the very excesses of the Renaissance, especially in regard to the sexual relation, made it impossible any longer to hold up the monastic ideal of celibacy as the life of Christian perfection, especially in view of the unchaste lives of the clergy

themselves. It is doubtful whether the Protestant Reformation could have succeeded in doing away with monastic institutions and the celibacy of the clergy, if it had not been for the new view of the marriage state that was provided by the Renaissance. Even in Latin countries, where the orders still continued to flourish, and the celibacy of the clergy was maintained, the clergy, secular and regular, had to give up concubinage, which they had persuaded themselves they might indulge in without sinning so greatly against their vow as in the marriage state. Before the Reformation concubinage of the clergy was winked at; but marriage was regarded as a deadly sin.

Zwingli in his 49th article said:

"I know of no greater scandal than the prohibition of lawful marriage to priests, while they are permitted for money to have concubines."

The discovery of America, the rounding of Africa, and the rediscovery of Eastern Asia, enlarged men's minds to a wonderful extent. Thinking men were obliged to change their opinions as to the extent of the earth and also as to its structure. Scientific opinions which had been condemned as heretical, because they conflicted with deductions from Scholastic Theology, were now justified, and Scholastic Theology was thereby discredited. A new race of men was discovered, which had to be taken into account in Christian Theology; and in some way the traditional dogma had to be modified for this purpose. Commerce and manufactures, and even agriculture, and so all departments of human life, were changed by these new relations. The Mediterranean Sea was no longer the centre of the earth, and the chief seat of its commerce, with never-ending commercial wars between Genoa and Venice, Constantinople and Alexandria. The seat of commerce now became the Atlantic Ocean, and the great traders became Portugal and Spain, England and Holland, France and Germany. The general result was inevitable. Italy lost its supreme importance to the world, and Rome could no longer dominate the nations. The

ideals of imperial Rome, the mistress of the nations bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, which dominated all thought in the Middle Ages, could no longer be maintained. The Holy Roman Empire with its pope was about to pass away, and a world of nations with national Churches and national religions took their place.

This was, after all, the greatest movement of the age: the formation of the modern nations by the destruction of the feudal system, the deprivation of the nobility of their exclusive privileges, and the exaltation of the commercial and industrial classes. This movement was inspired by a spirit of nationality, which demanded expression not only in the political structure of the State, but also in the religious structure of the Church.

All these circumstances and many more of lesser consequence produced an environment, and conditions and circumstances, that compelled a reformation in Church as well as in State. The longer it was postponed, the more imperative became the need; the greater the efforts to restrain it, the more powerful the rebound, which broke through all restraints.

The situation was ever becoming more serious and more dangerous. All Europe was in commotion, but Germany most of all. All men were anxiously longing for deliverance from an intolerable situation—the master word that would set them free. It was Luther who was called to speak this word.

Christianity had become as Judaism in the time of Jesus, a vast system of legalism, imposing "a yoke" on Christians which, as St. Peter says (Acts 15^{10}), "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear," involving all mankind in that wretched condition which St. Paul so well expressed when he exclaimed: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" (Rom. 7^{24}.)

As the situation of Christianity had become so very like that of Judaism in the time of Jesus and St. Paul, the only way out was to lay hold of the teachings of Jesus and St.

Paul, which alone enabled the early Christians to pass out from the bondage of Judaism into the freedom of early Christianity. It was the merit of Luther that he was enabled, by passing through an experience almost identical to that of St. Paul, to understand him better than any other before him since the time of Augustine, and to explain the Apostle's teaching as the great transforming power of the sixteenth century.

CHAPTER IV

THE SYMBOLS OF THE REFORMATION

It is our purpose to give, not an outline of the history of the Reformation, but the historical framework of the many different symbols that originated in that period, and to discuss the circumstances and causes which produced them.

§ 1. *The basis for the Reformation was laid by the Humanists, especially Erasmus in his editions of the New Testament and the Fathers, and Reuchlin in his Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon, and in their exposure of the corruptions of the Church by appealing to these norms.*

Erasmus of Rotterdam was really the greatest man of the Reformation period. If it had not been for his fundamental work, the Reformation would probably have been a failure. He exposed the corruptions of the Church in such a genial, witty way, that all intelligent and right-minded men were compelled to agree with him and to strive to reform them. His Greek New Testament of 1516 and his editions of the Fathers were indispensable to all who wished to appeal to the Bible and to antiquity.

Reuchlin was the chief of the German Humanists. He was devoted to the study of the Bible in its Greek and Hebrew originals. Hebrew Bibles had been printed by Jewish scholars much earlier, at Soncino, in Lombardy (1488), Naples (1491–3), Brescia (1494, used by Luther), Bomberg's first Rabbinical Bible (1516–17), and his manual editions (from 1517 onward). But a Hebrew grammar and lexicon were needed, such as Reuchlin published in 1506.

His controversy with the Dominicans of Cologne (1509–16)

originated out of a defence of Jewish scholars from unwarranted attacks, and the attempt to discredit Rabbinical literature and the Hebrew Bible. The Humanists rallied to his support, and they won a great victory. This rally gave Luther the support he needed at the beginning of his career. The *epistolae obscurorum virorum* (1514–17), of immense influence in those days, were one of the results of the conflict.

§ 2. *The Church in Spain removed many abuses complained of in other countries. This was due chiefly to the great Spanish Humanist, Francisco Ximenes, a Franciscan, who was sustained by Ferdinand and Isabella, and won the consent of the Popes.*

Ximenes († 1517) rose to the highest positions in the Church, as Archbishop of Toledo, Primate of Spain, Cardinal, and Inquisitor-General. He reformed the clergy, regular and secular, reorganised and strengthened the universities, and revived the study of the Scholastic Theology of Thomas Aquinas. He also issued the *Complutensian Polyglott* in 1513–17, the greatest Biblical work since Origen's *Hexapla*. He influenced Francisco Vittoria († 1546), the father of the newer Scholasticism, whose pupils, Melchior Cano († 1560) and Dominico Soto († 1560), exerted immense influence in the reformation of Theology, especially in the Council of Trent.

§ 3. *The English Reformation began under the bishops and the Crown, by reforms of administration. The leaders were Humanists, Cardinal Wolsey, Sir Thomas More, and Dean Colet. They aimed at a better education of the clergy and the people, and to make Theology less scholastic and more Biblical and historical. The distinction of the two jurisdictions of Church and State was the most prominent question. Its adjustment was prevented by the absolutism of Henry VIII, and the divorce question, which resulted, in* 1534, *in the rejection of papal supremacy and the recognition by Parliament and Con-*

vocation that the king was the supreme head of the Church of England as well as of the State.

The scheme of Wolsey was: (1) the higher education of the clergy; (2) the visitation of regulars and seculars; (3) an increase of bishoprics; (4) the suppression of useless monasteries. Wolsey founded Christ Church College in Oxford. He was sustained in his educational reforms by Warham, the Primate, and by Fox of Winchester.

Sir Thomas More succeeded Wolsey as Lord Chancellor in the same spirit. He was the most able and learned jurist of his time. His effort was to distinguish the two jurisdictions of Church and State. His criticism of abuses and ideas of reform appeared in his *Utopia* (1516).

In the year 1529 the holders of benefices were compelled to live in residence, and pluralities were forbidden. Wolsey was condemned for having transgressed the Statutes of Provisors and *Praemunire* of 1390, 1393, which forbade the receiving of Papal Bulls in England and declared the English Crown to be independent of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. In 1531 all the clergy were declared liable to the same penalty, and were compelled to purchase their release by large sums of money and the acknowledgment of the king "as the supreme head of the English Church and clergy," modified by "so far as the Law of Christ allows." In 1532 the payment of *Annates* was transferred from the Pope to the Crown; and in 1533 appeals to Rome were prohibited, except in certain definite ecclesiastical cases. In 1534 the Act of Supremacy was passed. In the following year Sir Thomas More and Fisher were executed, because they refused to accept Henry as the supreme head of the Church in England.

Henry succeeded in combining civil and ecclesiastical authority in the Crown, and thus laid the basis for most of the evils with which the Church of England has had to contend until the present day. Sir Thomas More was the martyr to the distinction of the two jurisdictions, which, if he had been sustained, would have put England in the front

of the Reform and anticipated the separation of State and Church of recent times. Luther and Calvin were in as great error at this point as the Pope and Henry VIII. Their error persisted until the eighteenth century, and its results still continue in the State Churches of Protestantism, and are only gradually disappearing.

§ 4. *The Spirit of Reform was also working in the spiritual life of the regular and secular priests. Among these we may mention the Brothers of the Common Life in Holland, the Augustinians of Germany, and the Oratory of Divine Love in Rome.*

The Brothers of the Common Life, an order founded *c.* 1391, continued a fruitful life, and greatly influenced Erasmus. Nicolaus Cusanus, Bishop of Brixen, as Legate of the Pope, undertook a wide-spread reform of the regulars in Germany (1450–2), with only partial success. The Oratory of Divine Love was founded in Rome in 1510, and had as members some of the ablest men in Rome, among whom was Cardinal Sadoleto. The influence of the Dominican Savonarola in Florence was not destroyed by his death (1498). The Augustinians were reformed by Andreas Proles († 1503) and Staupitz († 1524), the teacher and counsellor of Luther, an apostle of love. Peter Martyr Vermigli, Prior of the Augustinians of Lucca, came forth on the reformed side of Protestantism. Bernard Occhino, General of the Capuchins, also became a reformer.

Gieseler well says:

"The difference between these two parties, the Protestant Evangelical and the Catholic Evangelical, really consisted only in the importance they attached to the unity of the Church." *

Thus, when Luther left the Augustinians, his teacher Staupitz did not. Zwingli separated from Erasmus, Cranmer from Sir Thomas More. The founders of the Oratory in Rome all remained true to the Church in Italy, when Ochino

* *Eccl. History*, IV, p. 279.

and Peter Martyr went forth. In Spain the Humanists remained faithful to Rome. It was not a question of piety and reform, but of method of reform, and whether best made within the Roman Church or without.

§ 5. *Luther began his work of reform by the promulgation of the* 95 *Theses against the sale of indulgences by Tetzel, October* 31, 1517. *The Pope, through his legate Cajetan, tried to bring Luther to submission. In October*, 1518, *Luther appealed "from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better-informed."*

The immediate occasion of the origin of the Lutheran reform was the sale of indulgences by the Dominican John Tetzel, accompanied by the most exaggerated claims as to their value, and mingled with heretical, immoral, and blasphemous statements. These may be regarded as personal faults, for which the Church was not responsible. But they brought into prominence the inherent evils in the whole matter of the sale of indulgences, which had grown up gradually, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Church had distinguished from the most ancient times the four parts of repentance: *contrition, confession, satisfaction,* and *absolution.* The doctrine of indulgence is based on the part *satisfaction,* and this has two important phases: the one, satisfaction to the Church for temporal offence against the Church; the other, chastisement of the offender for his own benefit and improvement. All ecclesiastical discipline is an unfolding of the doctrine of satisfaction. It is not a satisfaction to the divine Majesty for the guilt and penalty of original sin, or personal sin against God. The atonement of Jesus Christ, and that alone, compensates fully for these. The only question is as to the temporal disciplinary penalties, and the guilt which is involved in them.

The Penitential system of the Church in its gradual development determined various gradations of penalty for ecclesiastical discipline. The practice of indulgence arose from the substitution of pious works of various kinds and

importance for these penalties, and eventually the estimation of gifts of money, or other substantial things, for the benefit of the Church, as pious works suitable for such indulgences.

The development of the doctrine of purgatory and its discipline carried with it the extension of the doctrine of compensation and indulgence into that state; and when to that was added the doctrine of intercession for the dead, there arose the extension of indulgence to those for whom their friends and relatives on earth made the intercessory compensation for purgatorial chastisements.

It is easy to see how this doctrine of indulgence was capable of grave abuse, especially when the Popes were in financial straits, and when it seemed to them that the interests of Christianity were involved in their financial struggles. This was the situation when Pope Leo X organised collections for the purpose of the rebuilding of St. Peter's in Rome, and appointed commissioners in the various countries with the authority of granting indulgences for these pious gifts. The Archbishop of Mainz was given authority by the Pope over the indulgences for his province of Mainz and Magdeburg; and he commissioned John Tetzel, a coarse, vulgar Dominican monk, but a fervid, popular preacher, to superintend the sale of these indulgences. He also issued an *Instructio Summaria* to direct the subcommissioners in their work. Tetzel was not permitted to preach these indulgences in electoral Saxony, in which Luther was professor of Theology in the recently founded university of Wittenberg; but his preaching in the border-lands was of such a shameless character that it was brought to the attention of Luther, not only by common report, but also in the confessional, and he felt called of God to attack and destroy this monstrous evil. In accordance with the custom of the time, he nailed ninety-five Theses against the sale of indulgences on the door of the castle church of Wittenberg, and undertook to defend these Theses against all adversaries.

Luther did not think that he was opposing any doctrine

or established institution of the Church. He maintained that he was holding up the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church against heresies, immoralities, and blasphemies. For the most part he was undoubtedly correct; but in this case, as was usual with Luther in the heat of controversy, he went to extremes, and did in fact come into conflict with the common teaching and practice of the Church, expressed in the writings of the greatest theologians and in official papal decrees. Thus he not only attacked the abuses of Tetzel and others of his kind, but also Popes and the most eminent divines, when he denied the indulgence itself and the whole doctrine of compensation in penance. He cannot be defended in the following statement in his sermon on Indulgence and Grace.

"First you ought to know that some modern teachers, such as the Master of the Sentences, S. Thomas [Aquinas], and their followers, divide Penance into three parts, namely, Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction: and although this distinction, according to their meaning, was found to be hardly or not at all grounded upon Holy Scripture, nor upon the early fathers of the Church, yet we are willing to let it stand and to speak after their fashion. . . . It cannot be proved from any Scripture that divine justice requires or desires any other punishment or satisfaction from the sinner than his hearty and true repentance and conversion, with a resolution henceforth to bear the cross of Christ and practise the good works before mentioned, also imposed on him by no man."

The doctrine of satisfaction for offences is in the *Asham*, אשם, of the Old Testament Law, and in the disciplinary teaching of Jesus and St. Paul, and in the penitential system of the Church from the earliest times. The satisfaction of the divine Majesty by the atonement of Jesus Christ for all sin never, in the Scriptures or in the ancient or mediæval Church, has been regarded as doing away with temporal chastisement of the sinner and temporal penalties imposed both by God Himself and His Church. Thus the Pope himself and the Scholastic Theology were challenged by Luther, and the Pope was obliged to interpose and send

his legate Cajetan to bring Luther to submission. This effort was not successful, and so Luther appealed (October, 1518) "from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better-informed." *

§ 6. *When the Bull of Leo X was published, stating the Roman doctrine of Indulgences, Luther appealed to a General Council (November 28, 1518). In January, 1519, Miltitz and Luther came to an agreement that both sides of the controversy should remain silent; and Luther made a public declaration of obedience to the Holy See. Tetzel was repudiated.*

A second stage in the conflict began when Leo X issued the Bull *Cum postquam* (November 9, 1518), reaffirming the common doctrine of indulgences. This made it evident to Luther that his conflict was not simply with Tetzel and abuses of the indulgences, but with the Pope himself and the common doctrine of the Church. Luther did not regard this decision of the Pope as settling the matter. He held with the Councils of Constance and Basel that only a General Council could finally determine articles of Faith; and so he appealed (November 28) from the Pope to a General Council of the Church. In the meantime, it had become evident to the Roman authorities that the conflict was much more serious than they had supposed, especially as the Elector of Saxony and other German princes defended Luther. Accordingly Charles von Miltitz, a Saxon nobleman, had already been commissioned as Nuncio (October 15, 1518) to try and arrange matters with the Elector and Luther. After an interview with the Elector in December, he disavowed and disgraced Tetzel on account of his abuses of the indulgence, and then, in January, 1519, made an arrangement with Luther himself. He found Luther reasonable, and, notwithstanding his appeal from the Pope to a Council, he agreed to submit to the Pope with these understandings: (1) that both sides should remain silent as regards the controversy; (2) that Luther should meekly state his case to

* Gieseler, IV, p. 31.

the Pope, that a commission should be appointed to investigate it, and that he would recant if any errors were shown in his position; (3) that Luther should confess that he had been too zealous, and, perhaps, unreasonable in his advocacy of the truth.

§ 7. *Doctor Eck revived the controversy in his disputation at Leipzig (June and July,* 1519). *He compelled Luther by inevitable logic to justify Huss in some things, and to deny the infallibility of Councils and Popes. This brought about the excommunication of Luther and his refusal, at the Diet of Worms* (1521), *to submit to any authority in religion but Scripture.*

The agreement between Miltitz and Luther was not kept, because Luther could not be held responsible for the other parties to the controversy. A few days after his letter of submission to the Pope, he was involved, against his will as he claimed, and only in self-defence, in a controversy with John Eck, Professor of Theology and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. A disputation was arranged in Leipzig, at first between Eck and Carlstadt, and finally (July 4–8) between Eck and Luther, on the primacy of the Pope. In this controversy Eck, who was a skilful and able disputator, had the best of it. He forced Luther by inevitable logic to justify Huss in some things, and so to go against the authority of the Council of Constance as well as the Pope. Luther was compelled to deny not only the infallible authority of the Popes but also that of the Councils. Thus his appeal to a General Council was no longer valid, because he would no more recognise its final authority than he would that of the Pope. He was thus compelled to rest his whole cause on the right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. Eck speedily went to Rome with full reports of the disputation, and of the rejection of the authority of Councils and Popes by Luther; and after due consideration the Pope issued a Bull, *Exsurge, Domine,* against Luther (June 15, 1520), condemning forty-one errors of Luther, and directing that his books should be burned.

Luther and his adherents were summoned to recant within sixty days or to suffer the usual penalties of the law against heretics. This Bull was intrusted to Eck for promulgation in Germany. It was published in Wittenberg October 3. In the meanwhile Luther had been at work on his three greatest tracts, which were published rapidly one after the other, and scattered all over Europe: (1) *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (August); (2) *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (October); (3) *Liberty of a Christian Man* (November).

In these tracts Luther maintains the positions taken at Leipzig, and does not hesitate to attack Popes, Councils, theologians, and common opinion, appealing to the Scriptures alone, and reasoning on their basis against abuses and errors in the Church. These tracts are full of fire, enthusiasm, and real genius. In them he said many noble things, which have ever since been regarded as fundamental to the Protestant Reformation; but also other things that have rightly been condemned as extravagant and erroneous, and, if not heretical, yet on the brink of heresy; and still others, that, when his followers tried to carry them out in practice, in the Anabaptist movements, he himself was compelled to challenge and rebuke. Luther said of himself: "I am rough, boisterous, stormy, and altogether warlike. I am born to fight against innumerable monsters and devils. I must remove stumps and stones, cut away thistles and thorns, and clear the wild forests." And so, like all men of his temperament, he lacked the faculty of nice discrimination, especially in difficult problems; and in a reckless way he did irreparable injury to some cherished institutions and well-established Christian doctrines.

Luther was now assured that his cause was a divine calling, and that he had finally broken with the papacy. Accordingly, on December 10, he burned the papal Bull, together with the Decretals of the Canon Law. A Bull dated January 3, 1521, excommunicated Luther and his adherents, and laid an interdict upon the places of their residence.

Luther was summoned to give an account of himself at the Diet of the Empire at Worms. He was heard before the Diet and summoned to recant. On the 18th of April, 1521, he declined the authority of Popes and Councils, and refused to submit to anything but *the authority of Scripture, to which alone his conscience was bound.*

Thus the great antithesis between Rome and Luther was stated. Rome bound the conscience by the authority of the Church as expressed by Councils and Popes. Luther bound his conscience by the authority of Scripture. The conscience was as much bound in the one case as in the other. Freedom of conscience was no more achieved in the one case than in the other. In fact, the result of the Reformation was to bind the conscience more than it had ever been bound before, not only by the decrees of the Council of Trent, but also fully as much by the Protestant Confessions and institutional changes.

It was not till a much later date that the conscience received recognition and value as an authority in religion.*

§ 8. *In* 1521 *Melanchthon issued his "Loci Communes," which became the standard system of Theology of the Lutheran Reformation. Luther published in parts his translation of the Bible* (1522–34).

Luther, protected by his safe conduct, was allowed to retire from Worms, but was put under the ban of the Empire. He was secretly taken to the Wartburg at Eisenach by his adherents, where he remained in seclusion for many months, until March, 1522, devoting himself to translations of the Scriptures into the German language, which were published and widely scattered in cheap editions. These greatly helped the progress of the Reformation.

In the meanwhile, Philip Melanchthon came to the front. He was trained as a humanist, and called to be professor of Hebrew and Greek at Wittenberg in 1518. He was thoroughly trained in the original Scriptures, in Philosophy and

* *V.* p. 272.

Theology, and became the great theologian of the Lutheran type of the Reformation. He issued his theological treatise, *Loci Communes rerum theologicarum,* in numerous editions, 1521–59. He rejected the Scholastic Theology, and in the method of the Positive Theology built his theology on the Scriptures, especially the Epistle to the Romans.

§ 9. *Zwingli began his work of reform independently of Luther, and from a different point of view. He began preaching Christ as the only Mediator, and the authority of Scripture, at Einsiedeln,* 1516, *and then from* 1519 *at Zürich. He also attacked the corruptions of the Church, especially in superstitions and idolatrous practices. His disputation with Faber and his Sixty-Seven Articles may be regarded as the basis of the Swiss Reformation.*

Many German authors try to make Zwingli dependent upon Luther. But Zwingli himself said: "All deference to Martin Luther, but what we have in common with him was our conviction before we knew his name." *

In fact, Zwingli's reform was from an entirely different point of view from Luther's. The sale of indulgences played a very unimportant part in the Swiss reform. Samson, the seller of indulgences in Switzerland, was driven forth by the Diet with the approval of the bishop. Zwingli was stirred against *idolatry,* rather than against the abuse of indulgences. He appealed to Scripture as did Luther, and indeed all the Humanists and reformers of every kind: but in other respects his reforms, both in doctrine and institution, took a different course from Luther's; and so these two reformers came into irreconcilable conflict, as men of an entirely different spirit. All efforts to reconcile them failed because of Luther's intolerance.

Zwingli, in a disputation with Faber at Zürich, in 1523, proposed and maintained Sixty-Seven Articles, which may be regarded as the basis of the Swiss Reformation. The chief controversy was as to the mass and the use of images in

* *V.* Häusser, *Period of the Reformation,* English edition, 1885, p. 127.

worship. These Articles of Zwingli are more comprehensive and dogmatic than Luther's Theses. They exalt Christ as the only Saviour and the Bible as the only infallible authority. They assert that the mass is no sacrifice, but a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross; and they assail various abuses. Zwingli's *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione* appeared in 1525. The Zürich Bible was prepared by Leo Judae in 1524–31.*

§ 10. *The Anabaptists were the radicals of the Reformation period. They represented the peasants and the labouring classes, and demanded more thoroughgoing reforms than the nobles and the middle classes, who followed Luther and Zwingli.*

Their most characteristic principle was the rejection of infant baptism. Both sections of the Reformation renounced them and persecuted them. Luther came forth from his seclusion at the Wartburg in March, 1522, and at once attacked Carlstadt and his party of false prophets, who taught *the inner word*, a visible kingdom of Christ on earth, community of goods, and the like, and rejected infant baptism.

Zwingli also attacked them (Grebel, Manz, Blaurock) at Zürich in public disputation in 1525, and then the magistrates imprisoned, drowned, or banished them. The Anabaptists of the sixteenth century represented a strange conglomeration of opinions and practices, many of which were revived in the conflicts of the seventeenth century and in socialistic and sectarian movements of modern times.

§ 11. *Luther entered into conflict with the chiefs of the Humanists, especially with Henry VIII of England and Erasmus.*

The controversy with King Henry was about the sacraments,† with Erasmus about the freedom of the will.‡ The

* *V.* Egli, *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation*, 1879; *Quellen zur Schweizer Reformationsgeschichte*, 1901–4.

† *Adsertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum*, 1521; Luther, *Contra Henricum*, 1522.

‡ *De Libero Arbitrio*, 1524; Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, 1525; Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, 1526.

result of this conflict was to alienate Erasmus and the greater proportion of the Humanists, and to exasperate the King of England and most other authorities, because of Luther's utter disregard of the proprieties of controversy, especially in dealing with such exalted persons, who were entitled by their position to reverential consideration. In fact, Luther's coarse and violent language was a great hinderance to reform. To him is chiefly due the separation of the Lutheran type of reformation from all others. He destroyed the unity of the Reformation by his insistence that it should go strictly in his way and in no other.*

§ 12. *The Diet of Speier, of* 1526, *unanimously concluded that a General Council should be convened for the settlement of the Church questions; and that in the meantime "every state shall so live, rule and believe as it may hope and trust to answer before God and his Imperial Majesty."*

At the second Diet of Speier, 1529, *the innovations in the Church were condemned, further reformation until the meeting of the Council was prohibited, and the Zwinglians and Anabaptists were excluded from toleration. The Lutherans protested* (April 25, 1529) *against all measures of the Diet, which were contrary to the Word of God, to their conscience, and to the decisions of the Diet of* 1526. *They appealed from the decision of the majority to the Emperor, to a General or German Council, and to impartial Christian judges. This gave the name of "Protestants" to the Lutherans. It subsequently became the common name for all the national Churches which departed from Rome.*†

Several Diets were held in Germany, and strenuous efforts were made by the Emperor to induce the Popes to reform the more glaring abuses of the Church, recognised by those who were most faithful to Rome. The Diets strove in vain to bring about concord, because, while Rome was entirely willing to do away with many abuses, and in fact did so, these concessions were not of sufficient importance to satisfy the

* *V.* Gieseler, IV, pp. 100 *seq.* † *V.* Walch, XVI, p. 364.

Emperor and the German princes who agreed with him, and were coupled with a stiff-necked insistence upon the recantation or suppression of the Lutheran and Zwinglian heresies. In the meanwhile the German and Swiss Reformers were active in organising churches entirely independent of Rome, in national organisations under the jurisdiction of the rulers of the land. The Diet of Speier in 1526 was compelled by circumstances to come to the following agreement:

"Thereupon have we [the Commissioners], the Electors, Princes, Estates of the Empire, and ambassadors of the same, now here at this present Diet, unanimously agreed and resolved, while awaiting the sitting of the Council or a national assembly [*i. e.*, without tarrying for the return of the deputation], with our subjects, on the matters which the Edict published by his Imperial Majesty at the Diet holden at Worms may concern, each one so to live, govern, and carry himself as he hopes and trusts to answer it to God and his Imperial Majesty."

This made the civil government supreme in religious as well as civil affairs. This agreement was altogether unsatisfactory to the Emperor and the Pope, and they determined to put an end to it. Accordingly at the Diet of Speier in 1529 the majority resolved to do so. They reasserted the ban of Worms against Luther and his adherents, which was to be strictly enforced in lands whose governments adhered to the majority; and so the Lutheran type of Reformation was to be hemmed in and prevented from spreading. Those governments which adhered to the minority, were forbidden to make any further innovations before the assembly of the Council; and so the Lutheran Reformation must halt in its proposed reforms. The Anabaptists and Sacramentarians, or Zwinglians, were excluded from toleration altogether; but the old doctrines and institutions sustained by Rome must be recognised as valid even in Lutheran lands.

The Lutheran reformers could not consent to these resolutions of the Diet without stultifying themselves. Accordingly they made a solemn *Protest and Appeal*, which won them the name of *Protestants*.

The essence of their protestation is this:

"We hereby protest to you, Well-beloved, and you others, that we, for kindred reasons, know not how to, cannot, and may not, concur therein, but hold your resolution null and not binding; and we desire, in matters of religion (pending the said general and free Christian Council or national assembly), by means of the godly help, power, and substance of the oft-mentioned late Recess of Speier, so to live, govern, and carry ourselves, in our governments, as also with and among our subjects and kinsfolk, as we trust to answer it before God Almighty and his Roman Imperial Majesty, our most gracious Lord" (April 19).

In their instrument of appeal (April 25):

"But these are matters which touch and concern God's honour, and the salvation and eternal life of the souls of each one of us, and in which, by God's command, and for the sake of our consciences, we are pledged and bound to regard before all things the same our Lord and God, in the undoubting confidence that your Royal Serenity, our beloved fellow princes, and the others, will in a friendly spirit hold us excused that we are not one with you therein, and that we cannot in such a matter give way to the majority, as we have several times been urged to do in this Diet, especially having regard to the fact that the Recess of the previous Diet of Speier specially states, in the article in question, that it was adopted by a unanimous vote, and in all honour, equity, and right such a unanimous decision can only be altered by a similarly unanimous vote. But besides this, in matters which concern God's honour and the salvation and eternal life of our souls, every one must stand and give account before God for himself; and no one can excuse himself by the action or decision of another, whether less or more."

The exclusion of the Anabaptists and the Sacramentarians (the Swiss) from toleration was approved by Luther and Melanchthon officially in their *Bedenken,* composed at the command of the Elector of Saxony.* Strictly, therefore, the term Protestant belongs to the Lutherans alone. But gradually and eventually the name Protestant became a common designation for all the Churches of the Reformation. However, it was not adopted by any of them officially. The Lutherans adopted the name Evangelical, the Swiss, Dutch, French, and others who followed Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, and their associates used the name Reformed. The English used

* *V.* Walch, XVI, p. 360.

the term Church of England; the Scotch, Reformed Church of Scotland.

§ 13. *A conference between the Roman and Reformed divines was held at Baden, in Aargau, Switzerland, May,* 1526, *when the Reformed triumphed. As a result Bern came over to the Reform, and the Ten Theses of Bern were composed, the fundamental Symbol of the Reformed Churches.*

These assert the sole headship of Christ over the Church. They reject: (1) the corporeal presence of Christ in the mass; (2) that it is a propitiatory sacrifice; (3) the invocation of saints; (4) purgatory; (5) the worship of images; (6) the celibacy of the clergy.

§ 14. *Bucer was a Humanist. He became the chief Reformer of Strasburg* (1523) *and Southern Germany. Influenced by both Luther and Zwingli, he took an independent, mediating position, and became the chief peacemaker of the Reformation.*

Bucer was born near Strasburg, educated at a Latin school, became a Dominican, and continued his education among Humanists at Heidelberg. He made the acquaintance of Luther in 1518, and subsequently of Zwingli and the Swiss reformers, with whom he was nearer in agreement, although he took an independent position. He left his order in 1520, and after ministering at several minor places he became, in 1523, with Capito, the chief reformer at Strasburg, and greatly influenced South Germany, especially the Free Cities. He prepared *Ordnung und Inhalt deutscher Messe*, 1524, and three different Catechisms (1524–44), and introduced the Presbyterian form of government, 1534. He also, with John Sturm, established a Protestant gymnasium, 1538, and seminary, 1544, the forerunner of the Genevan.

§ 15. *Luther and Zwingli came into conflict with reference to the Eucharist. A conference was held at Marburg, October,* 1529, *which resulted in agreement as to fourteen articles: but the Lutherans would not agree with Zwingli and the Swiss in the*

fifteenth, which was so modified as to express disagreement as to the Eucharist; and thus the two branches of the Reformation became antagonistic.

Bucer was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the conference at Marburg, October 2–4, 1529. As a personal acquaintance of Luther and Zwingli he endeavoured to reconcile them. The difficulty was that Luther seemed unable to discriminate between the Swiss who followed Zwingli, the Strasburg theologians, and Carlstadt, whose radical views had brought on the controversy as to the Eucharist in Wittenberg, whence it extended all over the Protestant world. As early as 1526 Bucer strove to influence Luther in the way of reconciliation, but in vain. Bucer was the chief adviser of Philip of Hesse, who invited the divines to the conference at Marburg. The chiefs on all sides attended: Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas, Myconius, and other Lutherans; and Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Hedio, and Sturm, the Strasburg and Swiss theologians. Osiander, Brenz, and Agricola represented the Southern Germans.

The fourteen articles on which they agreed were as to the Trinity, the Person of Christ, Faith and Justification, the Word of God, Baptism, Good Works, Confession, Secular Authority, Tradition, and Infant Baptism. They agreed as to the Eucharist on these questions: the necessity of partaking of both the bread and wine, the spiritual eating and drinking, and the rejection of the Roman mass, but retained their differences. As regards these they resolved:

"And although at present we are not agreed on the question whether the real body and blood of Christ are corporally present in the bread and wine, yet both parties shall cherish Christian charity for one another, *so far as the conscience of each will permit;* and both parties will earnestly implore Almighty God to strengthen us by His Spirit in the true understanding. Amen." *

Luther, during his retirement at the Wartburg, 1521–2, had become more conservative. He had devoted himself especially to the translation of the Scriptures, and this had

* The German original is in the archives of Zürich, according to Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* vol. VI, p. 646.

greatly increased his knowledge of the Bible and its authority over him. The Bible, as he interpreted it, must be adhered to without compromise and at all hazards. The more radical views expressed in his tracts of 1520, which had been carried to extremes by Carlstadt and the Anabaptists, were no longer adhered to. He opposed with all his might, not only the Anabaptists, but Carlstadt and the Swiss; and, unconsciously no doubt, but really, acted as if his interpretation of Scripture was infallible.

The Elector requested Luther, while still at Marburg, to confer with Melanchthon and Jonas in the preparation of articles of agreement for the Evangelicals. Luther himself sent to the Elector (October 10) what are known as the Schwabach Articles, seventeen in number. These followed the Marburg Articles closely, but emphasised the special Lutheran view of the Eucharist. They were adopted by the North Germans at Schwabach (October 16), but were not accepted by the South Germans or the Swiss.

§ 16. *At the Diet of Augsburg, in* 1530, *the Lutherans presented their Confession and plan of Reform in the Augsburg Confession, composed by Melanchthon. A Catholic confutation was prepared by Eck, Faber, Cochlaeus, and others. Melanchthon replied in his Apology.*

The Emperor (January 21, 1530) issued a summons for the Diet of the German Empire to meet at Augsburg, April 8, to deliberate upon the war with the Turks and upon matters of religion. The Emperor was exceedingly desirous of religious peace and the reform of abuses, that "as we all both are and contend under one Christ, so we all may live in the communion of one Church, and in harmony." Ample time was given the reformers for consideration. Luther, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, and Jonas met by direction of the Elector of Saxony at Torgau to prepare a summary of Faith to be presented to the Diet. This summary is known as the "Torgau Articles." *

* *V.* Balthasar, J. H., *Historie des torgischen Buchs*, 1741; Brieger, T., *Die Torgauer Artikel*, 1888.

On the basis of the Articles of Schwabach and Torgau, Melanchthon prepared an Apology, which, after consultation with Luther and others, was revised into the Augsburg Confession.* The final form was adopted June 23, at Augsburg, in a representative conference of theologians and chiefs of the reforming governments. It was presented to the Diet June 25.

The Confession in the first part consists of twenty-one chief Articles of Faith, of which they claimed in Article XXII that "there is nothing which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Church Catholic, or even with the Roman Church, so far as that Church is known from writers [the writings of the Fathers]." These articles treat of God, original sin, the Son of God, justification, the ministry of the Church, new obedience, the Church, what the Church is, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, confession, repentance, use of the Sacraments, ecclesiastical orders, ecclesiastical rites, civil affairs, Christ's return to judgment, free will, cause of sin, good works, worship of saints.

These articles are all brief, except the two of Free Will and Good Works. The second part consists of seven articles in which are recounted the abuses which have been corrected. These they claim to be "novel and contrary to the purport of the Canons, having been received by fault of the times." These are all discussed at length—namely, both kinds in the Lord's Supper, marriage of priests, the mass, confession, distinction of meats, traditions, monastic vows, and ecclesiastical power.

There can be no doubt that the Evangelicals were correct according to the standards to which they adhered; but in fact they were in conflict with traditions of the Roman Church, both as to Faith and Institutions, which had been fixed, many of them, for centuries and confirmed by papal authority, and some of them by conciliar and synodical decision. Upon these standards, not recognised as valid by the Evangelicals,

* *Cf.* Knaake, J. K. F., *Luther's Antheil an der Augsburgischen Confession*, 1863.

the Roman theologians based themselves in their reply. The chief of these theologians were Eck, Faber, and Cochlaeus, already recognised as the chief opponents of Luther and Zwingli. These presented to the Diet, August 3, their *Responsio Augustanae Confessionis*. They worked over it for several weeks. Five revisions were made before the Emperor was satisfied and willing to adopt it as his own. The polemic of the earlier draughts was greatly modified. There was a careful distinction between the consensus and the dissensus of the parties. The Roman position was sustained by numerous citations from the Bible, whose authority the Evangelicals could not question.

The Response approves the most of the Articles of Faith, with minor exceptions. The dissensus is chiefly as to the merit of good works, the relation of good works to justification, the exclusion of satisfaction from repentance, the invocation of the saints, and the definition of the Church. It is noteworthy that no exception is taken to Article X on the Eucharist, except to the neglect to state that the entire Christ is present under both forms of the sacrament, and that the substance of the bread has been transubstantiated into the body of Christ. It is evident that the chief dissensus is in the second part, which is entirely rejected except so far as certain minor abuses are concerned.

Melanchthon prepared an Apology of the Confession, which was presented by Chancellor Brück, in the name of the Evangelicals, September 22. The greater part of the Apology treats of these three: Justification, Repentance, and Institutional Abuses. It is significant that in the Tenth Article the concord with Rome is emphasised, and nothing is said in reply to the objection as to the omission of transubstantiation and of the entire Christ under both forms. The Apology also shows that most of the minor exceptions taken to the other articles are invalid, either owing to misinterpretation of the articles themselves or of the citations from Holy Scripture by the adversaries.

When Melanchthon wrote his Apology he had no official

copy of the *Responsio* before him, and there were numerous inofficial and incorrect editions of the Augsburg Confession published. Accordingly Melanchthon issued a revised edition of both the Confession and the Apology in 1531. He subsequently issued several other editions, in which he felt free to improve both documents without changing the substance. In 1540, however, important changes were made in the articles on the Lord's Supper, Free Will, and Good Works. These were not regarded as serious at the time; but, subsequently, controversies arose and became imbittered over just these questions. Then, when a serious difference divided the strict Lutherans from the followers of Melanchthon, or Philippists, as they were called, the former insisted upon strict adherence to the edition of 1531 as the *Invariata;* whereas the Philippists adhered to the edition of 1540, or the *Variata,* which in the doctrine of the Eucharist was more acceptable to the Calvinists, and so was regarded as crypto-Calvinistic, while the doctrine of Free Will and Good Works was more in accord with that of the irenic theologians among both Calvinists and Lutherans, and not more agreeable to High Calvinists than to High Lutherans.

The literature of the Augsburg Confession is enormous, especially in the German language. It is impracticable to give more than selections from it.

The text of the Confession and Apology is given in the *corpora doctrinae* of the sixteenth century, the *Book of Concord,* which took their place, and the collection of the Symbolic Books of the evangelical Lutheran Church, and finally in the more comprehensive collections of Symbols. An immense number of editions both in Latin and German was issued, especially in the sixteenth century. A full account of these as well as a history of the text is given in Köllner's *Symbolik der lutherischen Kirche,* 1837; pp. 228–353. Owing to the loss of the original Latin and German editions of the *Confession,* given into the hands of the Emperor, it is impracticable to ascertain the exact text of the original of 1530. The Latin text of 1531 is therefore the standard text of the *Invariata.*

The Augsburg Confession was first translated into English by Taverner, 1536. Several other modern translations have been made, the most important of which is that of Dr. C. P. Krauth, used by P. Schaff

in his *Creeds of Christendom*, 1877, and by H. E. Jacobs in his *Book of Concord*, 1883. The best modern edition of Latin and German is that of Tschackert, 1901. For a further study of the text *v.* Panzer, G. W., *Die unveränderte augsburgische Confession*, 1782; Weber, G. G., *Kritische Geschichte der Augspurger Confession aus archivalischen Nachrichten*, 1783–4; Kaiser, G. P. C., *Beitrag zu einer kritischen Literärgeschichte der Melanchthonischen Originalausgabe*, 1830; Rausch, E., *Die ungeänderte augsburgische Confession*, 1874.

A large number of histories of the Augsburg Confession, and Introductions thereto, have been written. The earlier are given by Koecher, *Bibliotheca Symbolica*, 1751, the later by Krauth and Schaff. Among these we may mention Chytræus, 1576; Müller, J. J., 1705; Cyprian, 1730; Salig, 1730; Pfaff, 1830; Förstemann, 1833–5; Rudelbach, 1829; Calinich, 1861; Plitt, 1867–8; Schirrmacher, F., 1876; Ficker, 1891.

Interpretations and expositions of the Confession are no less numerous. We may mention Hutter, L., 1598; Mentzer, 1613–15; Franz, 1611, 1620[2]; Varenius, 1664; Lebeau, 1842; Heber, 1846; Zöckler, 1870.

§ 17. *Four South German cities offered to the Diet of Augsburg the Tetrapolitan Confession, composed chiefly by Bucer. Zwingli also presented his own Confession. These were refused by the Diet, but confutations of both of them were written by the papal divines.*

The disagreement among the Evangelical Reformers about the Lord's Supper prevented their agreement on the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession. The Lutherans refused to unite with the South Germans and the Swiss in a Confession, partly because of the disagreement about this essential doctrine, but chiefly because they desired the recognition of their claims by the Diet, and were unwilling to compromise themselves with what were generally regarded as more radical views. Accordingly they took special pains to repudiate not only the Anabaptists but also the Swiss and South German Reformers. Thus the Evangelicals were divided at the Diet into three parties over against the united Romanists with the Pope and the Emperor at their back. This policy, for which the uncompromising Luther was chiefly responsible, did not succeed, but was a disastrous failure.

The conflict between the Lutherans and Zwinglians was so

sharp that no attempt at union was made. Zwingli simply sent his own Confession, *Ad Carolum Romanorum Imperatorem Germaniae comitia Augustae celebrantem Fidei Huldrychi Zwinglii ratio.* The Diet, however, would not receive it. But Eck wrote a refutation of it in his usual style, *Repulsio Articulorum Zwinglii*, 1530.

The South Germans were an intermediate peace-seeking party, who desired to unite with the Lutherans in a Confession; but they were not allowed to do so. Accordingly the representatives of the four cities, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, handed in a Confession, prepared chiefly by Bucer, which is known as the Tetrapolitan Confession. To it many other representative Germans of the Rhine and the South adhered.

The Diet declined to receive this Confession also. However, a confutation of it was written by Faber, Eck, and Cochlaeus, which was answered by a Vindication and Defence by Bucer.*

The only difference of any importance was in the interpretation of the Eucharist. They had not been able to agree with the Lutherans at the conference of Marburg; but in fact the South Germans and Swiss had no more objection to the Tenth Article than the Romanists, for there was no definition therein of the mode of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Tetrapolitan "*waren leib und wares blut warlich zu essen und trincken*" (18), and Zwingli's "*Verum Christi corpus adsit, fidei contemplatione*" (8) were regarded by both Lutherans and Romanists as unsatisfactory and heretical, as meaning nothing more than symbolical presence. This misinterpretation was due to the polemic writings of Zwingli and Bucer, and their criticisms of the Roman mass. All attempts to explain their views as in harmony with the Scriptures and the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession were unsuccessful.† Indeed, it was the policy of both

* Bucer published it with his reply at Strasburg in 1531, *Bekandtnuss der vier Frey und Reichstätt*, and a Latin translation in the same year.

† *V.* the careful statement of Köllner, pp. 369 *seq.*

the Lutherans and the Romanists at this time to keep the South Germans and Swiss apart from the Lutherans.

The Tetrapolitan of Bucer and the *Fidei ratio* of Zwingli are given by K. Müller in his collection of the Reformed Confessions; *cf.* Wernsdorff, G., *Confessionis Tetrapolitanae historia*, 1694, 1721[1]; Fels, J. H., *Dissertatio de varia Confessionis Tetrapolitanae fortuna*, 1755; Keim, T., *Schwäbische Reformationsgeschichte*, 1855; Dobel, F., *Memmingen im Reformationszeitalter*, 1878; Pätzold, A., *Die Konfutation des Vierstädtebekenntnisses*, 1900.

§ 18. *In Italy and Spain a number of religious orders were organised for the reformation of the Church on mediæval lines, the most important of which were the Capuchins and the Jesuits.*

The reforming spirit was, as we have seen,* as strong in Italy and Spain as elsewhere, but it assumed different forms.

(*a*) Gaetano da Thiene and Bishop Caraffa organised *the Congregation of Clerks Regular* (confirmed in 1524), all pastors, devoted to the cure of souls. They assumed the vow of poverty, but not of begging. This order was an outgrowth of the *Oratory of Divine Love*, organised by fifty to sixty representative men in Rome a few years earlier. It is important to notice the emphasis of the Catholic reformers on Love over against the Protestant emphasis upon Faith.

(*b*) Bassi and Fossombrone organised a new branch of the Franciscans, devoted to the contemplative life, called *the Capuchins* (1526).

(*c*) Antonio Zaccaria organised *the Barnabites* in 1533, devoted to the education of the young.

(*d*) Most important of all, *the Society of Jesus* was organised by Ignatius Loyola in 1534. The older rule of obedience was sharpened into absolute submission of mind and conscience to the superior. They began with the conscience in hearing the confessions of laymen. They were not allowed to accept fees, and so they made the best and most practical answer to the charge against the Church of greed for money and the sale of pardons. They organised retreats and religious exercises to deepen the religious life. They devoted

* *V.* pp. 159, 161.

themselves to theological education, and soon became the greatest scholars and teachers of Europe.

All these orders proposed a reformation in the monastic sense, in continuation of the spirit of the Middle Ages.

§ 19. *Geneva, after a disputation conducted by Farel, Froment, and Viret, adopted the Reformation in* 1535, *and received Calvin as teacher in* 1536. *Lausanne accepted the Reformation after disputation in* 1536. *In the same year Calvin issued his "Institutes," which became the doctrinal basis for the Reformed Theology. Articles for the government of the Church of Geneva were prepared in* 1537. *These were replaced by the Ecclesiastical Ordinances in* 1541. *Farel's Liturgy of* 1537 *gave way to Calvin's in* 1542.

Calvin was well trained in humanistic studies and in Law, and he became especially eminent as a teacher and for practical executive ability. His doctrine was shaped by a return from Scholastic Theology to the more ancient Positive Theology based on Holy Scripture and the fathers, especially Augustine, all put into the frame of the articles of the Apostles' Creed. There was nothing new in the substance of his teaching except his doctrine of the Eucharist and his unfolding of the doctrine of Justification by Faith. His chief merit as a reformer was not in doctrine but in institutions, in his organisation of the Church on a presbyterial basis, in his preparation of a normal liturgy for the Reformed Churches, and in his establishment of a thorough theological education.

The Geneva Academy was dedicated in 1559. This educated the ministry for French Switzerland, France, and even other countries, especially the fathers of Scotch and English Presbyterianism. The reason why Calvin's *Institutes* became normal for Reformed Theology was because of their Biblical and Augustinian elements, well organised in a system of positive theology. What is known as Calvinism is really a high, but not the highest, Augustinianism. In fact, Calvin was much more moderate and cautious in his Augustinianism than was Luther.

Furthermore, Calvin was a practical and an irenic theologian. He it was who, by friendly correspondence with Bullinger and other Zwinglians, brought the German and the French Swiss into harmony, and unified the Reformed Churches throughout Europe. With the leaders of the Church of England on the one hand and the Waldensians and Bohemian Brethren on the other he was in friendly and influential correspondence.

Calvin was not responsible for the later, higher, and more polemic Calvinism of his scholastic successors. He was a stern controversialist against Rome and the Unitarian heresies of his time. He is censured in modern times for his dealings with Servetus, but unjustly; for he simply represented the attitude of his age, in which all the Reformers shared.

§ 20. *In* 1536 *Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, began a conservative reformation, continued under the advice of Bucer and Melanchthon, but rejected by Luther, whose followers allowed the Emperor to crush it.*

In 1536 Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne; endeavoured to remove ecclesiastical abuses in a provincial council.*

In 1543, under the advice of Bucer and Melanchthon, a Reforming Constitution was issued,† written by Bucer.

This conservative reformation was crushed by the Emperor. Hermann was deposed by papal decree April 16, 1546, enforced by the Emperor January 24, 1547, the Lutherans abandoning him to his fate. But their own punishment came in the spring and summer of the same year, when the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse were captured by the Emperor. The Lutherans refused to sustain Hermann, because he declined to sign the *Augsburg Confession*. Hermann's *Consultation* was used by Cranmer in

* *Canones provincialis concilii Coloniensis*, Cologne, 1538, drawn up by Gropper.

† *Von Gottes Genaden unser Hermanns Erzbischofs . . . Bedenken*, Bonn, 1543.

making the *Book of Common Prayer*, and so was influential in shaping the Reformation in England, which was akin to Hermann's type.

§ 21. *The Churches of German Switzerland issued the Basel Confession of* 1534, *and the Helvetic of* 1536, *composed for presentation at the proposed General Council. These Churches were not represented at Trent, because they were already condemned as heretical and schismatic.*

The Confessions of German Switzerland were essentially Zwinglian, with important modifications, however, in a milder and less aggressive mode of statement. Two Confessions were issued at Basel: the first in 1534, composed by Œcolampadius and Myconius. It is simple and moderate. The second Confession of Basel is usually known as the *First Helvetic Confession*, 1536. It consists of twenty-seven Articles.* It was composed by a great gathering of Swiss and South German divines to be laid before the proposed General Council. Bullinger of Zürich was the chief of the large committee which composed it. Bucer was called into conference.

§ 22. *The Smalcald Articles, composed by Luther and adopted by the Protestant League in* 1537, *defined the Lutheran position with a view to their presentation at the Council of Trent. The Saxon Confession drawn up by Melanchthon, and that of Würtemberg by Brenz, in* 1551, *had the same purpose.*

The calling of a Council was also insisted upon by the Emperor and urged by many faithful adherents of Rome. The retaining of confiscated Church property was merely a matter of finance, and concerned the civil authorities rather than the reformers. The omission of the Canon of the Mass was the most serious question; and yet Rome had already, at

* Special works upon these Confessions are: Beck, *Dissertatio de Confessione Fidei Basil. Ecclesiae*, 1744; Burckhardt, *Reformationsgeschichte von Basel*, 1818; Hagenbach, *Krit. Geschichte der Entstehung und der Schicksale der ersten Baslerkonfession*, 1827.

the Council of Florence, recognised the Greek and Oriental Canons as valid notwithstanding their differences from the Roman Canon. The Lutherans, however, had been drastic in their revision. They had thrown out the Canon altogether as a distinct part of the Eucharistic liturgy, and only retained of the Canon the words of institution in the Biblical narrative, enclosed with suitable prayers. The words of institution were the essential thing, as was recognised by all. But the Roman prayers, involving the doctrine of sacrifice, and prayers for the dead, and intercession of the saints, were rejected because of their doctrinal implications; thus very serious differences existed, in that the rejection of these prayers involved the rejection of the doctrines they contained.

The Protestants, however, declined the invitation to attend the Council, because they were regarded and treated as heretics; and the controversial questions were taken up at once and decided, without giving them a representation or a hearing. Melanchthon wrote an explanation of their position: *De potestate et primatu Papae tractatus* (Appendix to *Smalcald Articles*, all in the Lutheran *Concordia**).

§ 23. *The Scandinavian countries were reformed after the Lutheran model and accepted the Augsburg Confession, but they retained the Episcopal form of Church government.*

The Scandinavian countries accepted the Reformation in the Lutheran form. Under the superintendence of John Bugenhagen in 1537, the Church of Denmark was reformed in accordance with Lutheran ideals; only an episcopal establishment was revived. But the new bishops were consecrated

* Bertram, J. C., *Gesch. des symb. Anhangs der Schmalk. Artikel*, 1770; Meurer, M., *Der Tag zu Schmalkalden*, 1837; *Confessio doctrinae Saxonicarum ecclesiarum Synodo Tridentinae oblata*, 1551. The original MS. with the title *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanae*, with Melanchthon's own corrections, is in the library of the Thomaskirche, Leipzig. *Confessio piae doctrinae, quae nomine illustrissimi principis ac domini Christophori Ducis Wirtembergensis et Teccensis, ac comitis Montisbeligardi . . . congregationi Tridentini Concilii proposita est*, 1551, 56, 59, 61 + ; *opera* Brentii, VIII, 1590, pp. 1–34; Pfaff, *Acta et scripta publica ecclesiae Wirtembergicae*, 1720.

by Bugenhagen, so that they have not episcopal succession. Norway, at this time a province of Denmark, was reformed by the Danish government. The reform was extended to Iceland, 1540–50. The Reformation was introduced into Sweden by the brothers Petri, pupils of Luther, in 1520, by Laurentius Andreae, and others, but was carried out by the king, Gustavus Vasa (1527–53), yet only gradually and with reactions. It did not finally succeed until the adoption of the Augsburg Confession in 1593 by a Synod summoned by his son Charles, when the Roman Catholics were banished from the kingdom. The episcopal succession was, however, preserved.

§ 24. *Continual efforts for reconciliation were made under the auspices of the Emperor, resulting in the Ratisbon Interim,* 1541, *the Augsburg Interim,* 1548, *and eventually in the Interimistic and Adiaphoristic controversies.*

The Emperor was exceedingly desirous of reconciling the different religious parties in Germany. Accordingly, at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, a small commission was appointed, consisting of Melanchthon, Brenz, and Schnepf on the one side, and Eck, Wimpina, and Cochlaeus on the other.

They agreed on all but three minor questions of doctrine and three questions of institution.* The disputed questions of doctrine were:

(1) "Whether our good works are meritorious, and how far we may rely upon them"; (2) "Whether the satisfaction was necessary to the forgiveness of sins, so far as the punishment is concerned"; (3) The invocation of saints.

These differences were not taken seriously at Rome. The Protestants agreed to the intercession of saints, but not to their invocation. There was also agreement on all matters of institution except three:

(1) The withholding of the cup from the laity; (2) the marriage of priests; (3) the change of canon in the German

* *V.* Walch, XVI, 1668; Pastor, *Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen,* 1879, s. 17 *seq.*

mass, and private masses. The Lutherans threw out the Canon of the Mass, all but the words of institution in the Biblical narrative.

Cardinal Campeggio in his report to Rome gave five chief demands of the Protestants: (1) The Lord's Supper under both forms; (2) the marriage of priests; (3) omission of the Canon of the Mass; (4) retaining of the confiscated Church property; (5) the calling of a Council.

In a consistory held July 6, at Rome, it was decided to yield nothing. These questions had been fought over with Wycklif and Huss, and decided against them; and Rome would have been inconsistent with the past to grant these demands to the Lutherans. At the same time two of them (1) and (2) were granted to the Greeks and Orientals at the Council of Florence; and one of them (1) was granted to the Calixtines of Bohemia without healing the schism. It was therefore not a matter of principle but of policy in this case.

The efforts for union were not discontinued, but persistently carried on by the intermediate party under the auspices of the Emperor and the Roman Catholic princes; yet continued to fail because it was impossible at the time to induce the leaders of the Reformation to submit to the domination of Rome. Private conferences in the interests of reconciliation were held at Hagenau in 1540 and Worms in 1541, the result of which was an agreement of the four theologians, Eck and Mensing, Melanchthon and Bucer, on the doctrine of original sin.* In the meanwhile Gropper, Veltwick, Bucer, and Capito were at work upon a platform of concord, under the auspices of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne.

At the Diet of Ratisbon this was submitted to a conference of von Pflug, Gropper, and Eck on the one side, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Pistorius on the other. In this document, called an *Interim*, there are twenty-three articles.

The sickness of Eck brought the conference to a close after they had agreed on five articles, including the doctrines of sin and justification. The remaining articles were not

* *V.* Pastor, s. 216.

sufficiently considered to be brought to an agreement, and all the efforts of the Emperor to reconcile the parties failed. A bitter conflict arose among the theologians who took part in this discussion with reference to the interpretation of the Interim and their part in it.

V. Bucer, *Acta Colloq. Ratisbon.* 1541; *Alle Handlungen und Schrifften zu Vergleichung der Religion,* 1541–2; *De vera Ecclesiarum Doctrina, Ceremoniis et Disciplina reconciliatione et compositione,* [1542]; *De concilio, et . . . judicandis controversiis Religionis,* 1545; *Von den einigen rechten Wegen . . . inn christ. Religion zu vergleichen,* 1545; *Wahrhafter Bericht v. Colloq. zu Regenspurg,* 1546; Eck, *Apologia adv. mucores et calumnias Buceri,* 1542; *Replica adversus scripta secunda Buceri apostatae super actis Ratisbonae,* 1543; Gropper, *Gegenberichtigung,* 1545; Nausea, *Colloquia privata,* 1541; *Epistola ad Frid. Nauseam,* 1550; Brieger, *De formulae concordiae Ratisbonensis origine atque indole,* 1870; Pighius, *Controversiarum præcipuarum in comitiis Ratisbonensibus tractatarum . . . explicatio,* 1542.

King Ferdinand of Austria renewed the efforts for reconciliation through Friedrich Nausea. Another conference was held at Ratisbon in 1546, in which von Pflug took the principal part. This conference only resulted in controversial writings.

V. Major, *Kurtzer und warhafftiger Bericht von dem Colloquio, so in diesem 46. Jahr zu Regensburg der Religion halben gehalten* (*v.* Hortleder, s. 576–7); Bucer, *Disputata Ratisbonae in altero colloquio a XLVI,* 1548; Hofmeister, *Actorum colloquii Ratisb. ultimi,* 1546; Cochlaeus, *Actorum colloquii Ratisb. ultimi narratio,* 1546; Latomus, *Handlungen des Colloquiums zu Regenspurg,* 1546; Walch, XVII, 1478 *f.;* Pastor, s. 305 *seq.*

Luther died February 18, 1546, and with him the unity of the Lutherans, who henceforth became divided; some, the strict Lutherans, adhering to Luther's views where he differed from Melanchthon, the others following Melanchthon, who now developed, more naturally, apart from the influence of Luther, in a more humanistic and irenic direction.

The Emperor now determined to reduce the rebellious Protestants to submission. He declared war upon the Elector

of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, June 17, 1546, defeated them, and made them prisoners in 1547. For a season he was triumphant all over Germany, until, in 1552, his chief supporter, Moritz of Saxony, turned against him and defeated him, released the imprisoned princes, and won for the Protestants religious peace by the treaty of Passau.

During the years of the Emperor's triumph the Protestants were offered the Interim of Augsburg of 1548.

The Augsburg Interim was based on a formula of union prepared by von Pflug, Bishop of Naumburg, on the foundation of that of Ratisbon. It was revised by Agricola of Brandenburg. It contains twenty-six sections.

The Emperor demanded from Rome concessions as to the giving of the cup to the laity and the marriage of priests. The opinion of the Cardinals was favourable,* and the Pope went so far as to grant indulgence in these matters in a Bull given in charge of his *nuntius* to use at his discretion.

The Interim divided the Protestants. It was accepted in Würtemberg, the Palatinate, the chief free cities of the South, and Brandenburg in the North; and, with certain alterations (as the Leipzig Interim), in Saxony. The Catholic constitutions and usages were allowed as *Adiaphora*.† This brought about the Interimistic controversy, and then also the Adiaphoristic controversy.

One happy result of these controversies was to finally settle the question of religious institutions in the liberty and variety of German practice, thus avoiding the distressing controversies which subsequently distracted the British Churches. But they greatly weakened German Protestantism in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Formula sacrorum emandandorum in comitiis Augustanis anno 1548, *a Julio Pflugio composita*, ed. C. G. Müller, 1803; Bieck, *Das Dreyfache Interim*, 1721; Schmid, *Controversia de adiaphoris*, 1807; Preger, W., *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, 1859–61; Beutel, G., *Über den Ursprung des Augsburger Interims*, 1888; *cf.* Melanchthon, *Bedencken aufs Interim*, 1548; Amsdorf, N., *Antwort, Glaub und Bekaenntnis auf*

* Martene, *Collectio*, VIII, 1180.

† ἀδιάφορα = *indifferent.*

das schoene und liebliche Interim, 1548; Aquila, C., *Wieder d. lügner u. verleumder M. Eislebium Agricolam. Noetige verantwortung u. ernstliche warnung wieder das Interim*, 1548.

§ 25. *The Reformation in England was conducted in a gradual and conservative way by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, resulting in the Bishops' Book* (1537), *the Great Bible* (1539–40), *Cranmer's Bible* (1540–1), *the Book of Common Prayer* (1548–52), *the Articles of Religion* (1553), *and the Episcopal organisation of the national Church of England.*

After the execution of Sir Thomas More and of Fisher in 1535, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, became most influential in the English Reformation. He espoused the king's cause in the matter of divorce and managed to keep in favour with the king to the end of his reign. Ten Articles were issued in 1536 of a character similar to that of the Augsburg Confession; and Six Articles in 1539, reacting toward Rome. *The Institution of a Christian Man* was issued in 1537 (the Bishops' Book), *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* in 1543 (the King's Book), the *Great Bible* in 1539–40, Cranmer's Bible in 1540–1, the King's Primer in 1545.

As soon as Edward VI ascended the throne of England Cranmer called Peter Martyr and Bernardino Occhino to Oxford (1547), and Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius to Cambridge (1549), and under their advice continued the reformation of the Church of England.

The first *Book of Homilies* and the *Royal Injunctions* were issued in 1547, the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1548–9. The first Act of Uniformity was passed in 1549, the second in 1552. The *Forty-two Articles of Religion* appeared in 1553.

§ 26. *At the Diet of Augsburg*, 1555, *a Religious Peace was concluded, which made the religion of the subjects to depend upon that of their princes, who were guaranteed the choice between the Catholic religion and the Augsburg Confession.*

Two things remained unsettled to cause endless trouble in the future:

(1) It was not agreed that clerical princes should have the same freedom as the secular.

(2) The rights of the Protestant and Catholic principalities were not defined.

§ 27. *After the Catholic reaction under Mary, the Reformation advanced under Elizabeth, resulting in the Act of Uniformity and Book of Common Prayer of* 1559, *the Thirty-nine Articles of* 1571, *and the final establishment of the Church of England as a national episcopal Church.*

After the Catholic reaction of the short reign of Mary, 1553–8, Elizabeth ascended the throne and the work of the English Reformation was continued. The *Book of Common Prayer* was adopted in 1559 with an *Act of Uniformity* which made it binding on all the churches of the kingdom. Matthew Parker was made archbishop, the father of the episcopate of the Anglican Church. Convocation reduced the *Forty-two Articles of Religion* to thirty-nine, which were adopted by Parliament in 1571, and have since been the doctrinal symbol of the Church of England. But in fact they were not altogether satisfactory either to the party of reaction, or to the party of progress; and the Anglican Church and her daughters in the British Colonies have made the *Book of Common Prayer* the real standard both for Faith and Institution.

The chief works on the Thirty-nine Articles are: Rogers, T., *The English Creed*, 1579; *The Faith, Doctrine and Religion, . . . expressed in the XXXIX Articles*, 1607; Ellis, 1700; Burnet, 1715; Lamb, 1829; Browne, E. H., 1850–3; Hardwick, 1851; Davey, 1861. Forbes, 1867–8; Green, E. T., 1896.

The Book of Common Prayer has passed through a series of revisions, which have not made any substantial change in its doctrines and institutions. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI, 1549, gave place to the second in 1552, then that of Elizabeth, 1560; that of James I, 1604; Laud's, 1637, and the final revision of Charles II, 1662; all published at the time, often reprinted, and finally in facsimile by W. Pickering, 1844. Other revisions have been made in Ireland, 1877, and the United States, 1789 and finally 1892. There have been a large number of works upon the Book of Common Prayer, among which I may mention: E. Cardwell, 1839, 1841²; W. Maskell, 1846;

A. J. Stephens, 1849–50; F. Proctor, 1855; Lathbury, 1859; J. H. Blunt, 1868; C. M. Butler, 1880; J. H. Garrison, 1887; A. T. Wirgmann, 1877; G. W. Sprott, 1891; F. A. Gasquet, 1891; C. E. Stevens, 1893; J. Cornford, 1897; J. Dowden, 1899; L. Pullan, 1900; W. H. Frere, 1901; H. Gee, 1902; E. Daniel, 1901; A. R. Fausset, 1904.

§ 28. *The Reformed Churches adopted a variety of Confessions in the different countries. The chief of these were the Zürich Consensus,* 1549, *the Geneva Consensus,* 1552, *the Gallican Confession,* 1559, *the Scotch,* 1560, *the Belgic,* 1561, *the Heidelberg Catechism,* 1563, *and the Hungarian Confession,* 1557–70.

In Switzerland the original Zwinglian type combined with the Calvinistic to produce the Reformed type in the *Zürich Consensus* (1549), the joint production of Bullinger and Calvin; and the *Rhaetian Confession* (1552) approved by Bullinger and adopted by a synod of the Reformed Churches of Rhaetia. The *Consensus* of Geneva was rather a polemic treatise than a Confession, though signed by the company of pastors in 1552.

The Emden Catechism was prepared by John a Lasco in 1554 for East Friesland.

The Gallican Confession was prepared by Calvin and his pupil, Chandieu, and was adopted with slight modifications by the first Synod of the Reformed Churches of France, at Paris, in 1559.

The Scotch Confession was prepared by John Knox, a pupil of Calvin, and was adopted by the General Assembly in 1560.

The Belgic Confession was composed by Guy de Brès in 1561 for the Church of Flanders and the Netherlands, and was adopted by the Synod of Emden in 1571.

The Heidelberg Catechism was composed by Ursinus and Olevianus (1563), under the influence of Melanchthon as well as of Calvin, was adopted by the German Reformed Church, and is of a milder type of Calvinism than the other Confessions mentioned above. All these Churches also adopted the Calvinistic institutions of government and worship.

The Hungarian Churches issued a series of Confessions dealing with special doctrines in a Calvinistic sense, the Confession of Kolosvar, 1559; Debreczin, 1560–2; Tarczal, 1562–3; and finally that of Czenger in 1570, in all of which Melius, the Hungarian Calvin, was the master mind: but these were displaced by the Second Helvetic and the Heidelberg Catechism, which are the official symbols at the present time.

The chief literature on these symbols is as follows:

(1) *Consensio mutua in re sacramentaria ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae et J. Calvini ministri Genevensis ecclesiae*, 1549 (Calvin, *opera*, VII, pp. 689–748).

(2) *Consensus pastorum Genevensis*, 1552 (Calvin, *opera*, VIII, pp. 249–366); Gaberel, J., *Histoire de l'église de Genève*, 1853–62; Roget, A., *L'église et l'état à Genève du vivant Calvin*, 1867.

(3) Beza, *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France*, 1580; *Confession de Foi et Discipline ecclésiastique des églises réformées de France*, 1864; *Gallicarum ecclesiarum Confessio*, 1566 (English trans. in Quick's *Synodicon*, 1692); Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France*, 1710.

(4) Dunlop, W., *Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Books of Discipline, etc. of publick authority in the Church of Scotland*, 1719, 22; Knox, J., *Historie of the Reformation of Religioun in Scotland*, 1584, 1664, 1831, 1846; Calderwood, D., *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 1678, 1842–9; Spottiswoode, *History of the Church and State of Scotland*, 1668, 1677[4], 1847–51.

(5) Revius, J., *Confessio Eccl. Belgicarum* (Greek and Latin), 1623, 1627[2], 1660, 1661; *Confessiones Fidei Eccl. Reform.* 1635, 38, 60 +; Vinke, *Libri symb. eccl. reform. Nederlandicae*, 1846; Brandt, G., *Historie der Reformatie in en ontrent de Nederlanden*, 1671–4 (French, 1726; Eng., 1720–3).

(6) *Catechesis religionis Christianae*, 1563; *Catechismus oder christlicher Underricht*, 1563; De Witte, P., *Catechizing upon Heidelberg Catechism*, 1654; Lenfant, *L'innocence du Catéchisme de Heidelberg*, 1688; Alting, H., *Historia Eccl. Palatinis*, 1680, 1701; Köcher, J. C., *Cat. Gesch. der Reform. Kirchen . . . sonderlich d. Schicksaale des Heidelb. Catechismi*, 1756; v. Alphen, H. S., *Gesch. u. Literatur des Heidelb. Katechismus*, 1796–7, 1800; Nevin, J. W., *History and Genius of the Heidelb. Catechism*, 1847; Sudhoff, K., *Theol. Handb. zur Auslegung der Heidelberger Katechismus*, 1862; Schotel, G. D. J., *Geschied. d. Heidelb. Cat.* 1863; Doedes, J. I., *De Heidelberg. Cat. in zijne eerste Levensjaren*, 1563–67, 1867; *Tercentenary Monument. In commemoration of the 300*

Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism; Schaff, P., *Der Heidelberger Katechismus,* 1863, 66; *Die ältesten Ausgaben d. Heidelb. Catechismus,* 1867.

(7) Bod, P., *Hist. Hungarorum eccl.,* ed. L. W. E. Rauwenhoff and C. Szalay, 1888–90; Godkin, E. L., *History of the Protestant Church in Hungary,* 1854.

§ 29. *The Council of Trent* (1545–63) *issued as the result of its deliberations a definition, especially of controverted questions, under the title of "Canons and Decrees." It was confirmed by the Pope* (1564), *and thus became the symbol of the Roman Church over against Protestantism. To this was added the Profession of the Tridentine Faith* (1564), *and the Roman Catechism* (1566).

The Council of Trent was convened by the Pope at Trent, March, 1545. It was opened December 13 and continued with several interruptions till December 4, 1563. The decisions were collected under the title *Canones et Decreta.* They were confirmed by a Bull of Pius IV, January 26, 1564, and have since been the chief dogmatic authority of the Roman Catholic Church. To this must be added the *Profession of the Tridentine Faith,* prepared by a College of Cardinals, and sanctioned by the Pope, in 1564. It is binding upon all Catholic priests and public teachers in Catholic institutions. The *Roman Catechism* was prepared, under the authority of the Pope and the supervision of Cardinal Borromeo, by four eminent scholars, and was sanctioned by Pope Pius V, September, 1566. It is intended for priests, as the title *ad Parochos* implies.

So soon as the Council of Trent had finished its labours, and the Roman Church had adopted its canons and decrees with the *Tridentine Profession of Faith* and *Catechism,* the whole Roman Catholic world rallied on the basis of this reformation, and under the lead of the Jesuits began an attack on Protestantism.

Jesuit scholars of great ability were called to institutions of learning, and by their writings and their training, especially of the young nobles, soon brought about so strong a reaction

against Protestantism that it was gradually driven out of all countries where Catholic princes ruled. The suppression began in Bavaria in 1561.

The text of the *Canons and Decrees* was published officially in Rome, edited by P. Manutius in 1564; for the first time in Germany, at Dillingen, 1565, at Louvain, 1567, and frequently elsewhere; edited by Chifflet, Antwerp, 1640; Le Plat, Antwerp, 1779; Richter and Schulte, 1853; Smets, Latin and German, 1854[4]; translated into French by Heruetus, 1564; into English by Waterworth, 1848; Buckley, 1851. The History of the Council was first given by P. Sarpi, under the pseudonym Polanus, in Italian, London, 1619; Latin, 1620; English by Brent, 1619, 29[2], 40[3], 76; French by Deodatus, Geneva, 1621; by Houssaie, Amsterdam, 1683, 1699[4]; by Courayer, with historical notes, Amsterdam, 1736; German, by Rambach, Halle, 1761. Sarpi's History was not satisfactory to Rome, and Pallavicini undertook another History to correct him, written in Italian, Rome, 1656–7; Latin, Giattino, Antwerp, 1670, ed. Zaccharia, Florence, 1792–9, *cf.* Brischar, *Beurtheilung der Controversen Sarpi's und Pallavicini's*, 1844. Numerous historical accounts of the Council and its Acts have been written by Visconti, 1719; Du Pin, 1721; Salig, 1741–5; Le Plat, 1781–7; Mendham, 1834, 42, 46; Göschl, 1840; Wessenberg, 1840; Paleotto, 1842; Bungener, 1847; Danz, 1846; Buckley, 1852; Baschet, 1870; Sickel, 1870–2; Theiner, 1874; Döllinger, 1876; Littledale, 1888; Froude, 1896; Mayer, 1900–1; Carcereri, 1910–11.

The Catechism of the Council was published in 1566, edited by P. Manutius, and often reprinted in different countries. It was translated into English by Donovan, 1829, and Buckley, 1852. *The Catechism for Curates* was published at Lyons, 1659, and translated into English, 1687; *v.* Köcher, J. C., *Catech. Gesch. der Päbstlichen Kirche*, 1753.

§ 30. *There were two Confessions of a mild and conciliatory character composed after the Council of Trent with a view to uniting Protestants: the Second Helvetic* (1566), *and the Consensus of Sendomir*, 1570.

(1) The most important of these is the *Second Helvetic*, composed by Bullinger in 1562, but not adopted till 1566. It gives the consensus of the original Zwinglian Churches with the later Calvinistic. It unites the German and French Swiss.

This Confession was eventually adopted or approved by all the Reformed Churches.*

(2) *The Consensus of Sendomir* of 1570, in which the milder Lutherans, the Calvinists, and the Bohemians of Poland united. This consensus was again confirmed by General Synods at Cracow (1573), Petricow (1578), Vladislav (1583), and finally at Thorn (1595).† Its spirit passed over into the Brandenburg Confessions of the seventeenth century.

§ 31. *The three chief sects before the Reformation, the Waldensians, the Lollards, and the Bohemian Brethren, became incorporated with the Melanchthonian or Calvinistic types of the Reformation.*

The numerous sects that had been suppressed in public before the Reformation, yet which lived and worked in secret, took advantage of the Reformation to carry on their work in a more public and aggressive manner. The more radical of these reappeared among the Anabaptist sects, the more conservative united with the great historic Churches of the Reformation.

(1) The oldest of these sects was the Waldensians. They were visited by Farel and two other representatives of French Switzerland, in the Piedmont valley, 1532, when they adopted the Calvinistic type of the Reformation, to which they had been previously inclined. Their catechism and confession were adapted to the Gallican, and they have ever since been counted among the Reformed Churches.‡

(2) The followers of Wycklif were known in England as the Lollards. They persisted in secret until the Reformation,

* *V.* Thomas, L., *La Confession Helvétique*, 1853; Böhl, E., *Confessio Helvetica posterior*, 1866.

† *V.* Jablonski, D. E., *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis*, 1731.

‡ *V.* Perrin, J. P., *Histoire des Vaudois*, 1619; Léger, J., *Histoire générale des églises évangéliques des Vallées de Piémont ou Vaudoises*, 1669; Morland, S., *History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont*, 1658; Palacky, *Verhältniss der Waldenser zu den böhmischen Secten*, 1869; Muston, A., *L'Israel des Alpes*, 1851.

when they were absorbed in the Puritan party of the Church of England.*

(3) The followers of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, in Bohemia, divided in 1420 into two parties: the more conservative Calixtines or Utraquists, who in 1433 accepted communion in both kinds offered them by the Council of Basel, which induced most of them to return to the Catholic Church; and the Taborites who refused any compromise of principles. The latter were finally overcome in 1453, and driven into obscurity for a while. They reappeared just before the Reformation in 1467 as the Bohemian Brethren. There seems to have been doubt as to the validity of their baptism in those times of persecution, and so they were all rebaptised. They then received a bishop with episcopal succession from a Waldensian bishop, Stephen of Austria, and three priests of their own number were ordained. As an organised Church they entered into communication with Luther. They presented to him an ancient catechism, which so much resembled the Waldensian that the two must have had a common source. They were indorsed by Luther, and then grew with such rapidity that at the beginning of the sixteenth century they had four hundred parishes in Bohemia.

The Bohemian Brethren, November 14, 1535, presented to King Ferdinand at Vienna: *Confessio Fidei ac Religionis, Baronum ac Nobilium Regni Bohemiae.*

The Second Bohemian Confession was composed by Pressius and Krispin, and adopted in 1575 at a diet in which all the reforming bodies were united, Lutherans, Calvinists, the older Utraquists, and the Bohemian Brethren. These Confessions are both of the Melanchthonian type. The Bohemian Protestants flourished during the reigns of Ferdinand I, Maximilian II, and Rudolph II; but they were exiled and well-nigh exterminated by Ferdinand II, 1619–37, during the

* *V.* Lechler, G. V., *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation*, 1873; Jundt, A., *Les Precurseurs de Jean Huss au 14 Siècle*, 1877; Marshall, W., *Wycliffe and the Lollards*, 1884; Gairdner, J., *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, 1908.

Thirty Years' War.* However, a remnant continued to exist under an episcopal form of government and with a Melanchthonian type of doctrine in Bohemia and Moravia; and in 1722 a body of exiles, under the influence of Count Zinzendorf, organised the Church of the Moravian Brethren.

* Camerarius, J., *Historica narratio de fratrum orthodoxorum ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia, et Polonia*, 1605; Pescheck, C., *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, 1850; Gindely, A., *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder*, 1857; *Quellen zur Gesch. d. böhm. Brüder*, 1861; Bezold, Fr. v., *Zur Geschichte des Husitenthums*, 1874.

CHAPTER V

THE SYMBOLS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The Symbols of the period of the Reformation defined the chief doctrines and institutions in the controversies between Protestantism and Rome, and also, to a limited extent, exposed some of the most important differences among the Protestants themselves. The ancient Greek Church had not yet taken its official position with regard to these controversies, and both sides strove to win her support. Moreover, the separate Protestant Churches had still to define their relation to each other, and also to the various controversies that arose within themselves. Accordingly a second period of symbolical formation arose, beginning in the last quarter of the sixteenth century and continuing into the middle of the seventeenth century.

The Greek Church was compelled eventually to consider the questions raised by the great Reformation of the Western Church, and to define its position with reference to the doctrinal determinations of the separated Churches.

§ 1. *The Greek and Russian Churches agreed in three Symbols, which define their position over against Protestant and Roman doctrines:* (1) *The Answer of Jeremiah* (1576–1672); (2) *The Confession of Mogilas,* 1643; (3) *The Confession of Dositheus,* 1672.

(1) The earliest of these was the *Answer of Jeremiah,* the Patriarch of Constantinople, to the communications of the Lutheran theologians Andreae and Crusius. It was written in 1576 and received the approval of the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. All of the distinctive doctrines of the Protestant

Reformation were rejected with the exception of the institutional questions of communion in both kinds and the marriage of priests.

(2) The second of the official Confessions is that of Peter Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kieff and Father of Russian orthodoxy, composed in 1640 in the form of a Catechism for the Russian Church. It was revised and adopted by a Provincial Synod at Kieff, and again revised by a Synod of Greeks and Russians at Jassy in 1643, under the influence of Meletius Syriga, Metropolitan of Nice, and signed by the four Eastern patriarchs. It thus became the Symbol of the entire Russo-Greek Church. It defines the Faith of the Greek Church against Protestantism on the one hand and Romanism on the other. It was especially directed against Cyril Lucar, who was influenced by the Reformed Churches and introduced some characteristically Calvinistic doctrines into the Greek Church, especially in his *Confession* (Latin, 1629; Greek, 1631). His high position as patriarch, at first of Alexandria and then of Constantinople, gave his confession great importance; but he was condemned and anathematised by a number of provincial Synods. This Confession maintains, in the answer to Question 5, that in the Nicene Creed in the Constantinopolitan form "all things that pertain to our Faith are so accurately set forth, that neither more nor less ought to be believed by us, nor (these) in any other sense than that in which those Fathers understood (them)."

The *filioque* of the Western Church is rejected; but in other respects, so far as there is any exposition of the Creed that touches on questions of the Reformation, this Confession agrees with the Council of Trent against the Protestant Confessions. This is clear in the doctrine of the seven Mysteries, and especially in the doctrine of the Eucharist; so also in the recognition of the authority of the Fathers and in the doctrine of Justification.

(3) The third official Confession is that of Dositheus. This was adopted by the Synod of Jerusalem, March 16, 1672, and signed by Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and

afterward by sixty-eight Eastern Bishops of the Greek and Russian Churches. It was especially directed against Protestantism in both its Lutheran and Calvinistic forms. It follows the order of Cyril's Confession, which it refutes article by article. It is less complete and more polemic than the Confession of Mogilas, but the doctrinal position is the same.

Orthodoxa Confessio catholicae atque apostol. ecclesiae orientalis a Petr. Mogila compos., a Meletio Syrigo aucta et mutata, gr. c. praf. Nectarii curav. Panagiotta, 1662; *cum interp. lat.* ed. L. Normann, 1695; *c. interp. lat. et vers. german.* ed., Hofmann, 1751; Eng., 1898; *Clypeus orthodoxae fidei, sive apologia ab synodo Hierosolymitana sub Hierosolym. patriarcha Dositheo composita adversus Calvinistas haereticos*, 1676, 1678; Ittig, *Dissert. de actis synodi Hieros.* 1696; *Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem . . . 1672*, ed. Robertson, 1899; *Confessio cathol. et apost. in oriente ecclesiae, conscripta compendiose per Metrophanem Critopulum, ed. et. lat. redd.* Hornejus, 1661; *Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis*, ed. E. J. Kimmel and H. Weissenborn, 1843–50; Michalcescu, *Die Bekenntnisse . . . der griech.-oriental. Kirche*, 1904; *Acta et scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium et patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae*, 1584; Cyrillus Lucaris, *Confessio Christ. fidei*, 1629, *c. additam, Cyrilli*, Gr. et Lat., 1633; Thos. Smith, *De Graec. Eccl. . . . Epistola*, 1676, 98; Eng., *Account of the Greek Church*, 1680; *Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucaris*, 1707; Aymon, J., *Monuments authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, 1708; *Lettres anecdotes de Cyrille Lucaris*, 1718; Covel, J., *Account of the present Greek Church*, 1722; Schelstrate, E., *Acta eccl. orientalis contra Lutheri haeres.* 1739; Dietelmaier, *De Metrophane Critopulo*, 1769; Pichler, A., *Der Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris*, 1862; Otto, J. C. T., *Des Patriarchen Gennadios Confession*, 1864.

§ 2. *There were many questions of controversy, which do not appear in the Symbols of the Reformation, yet which divided Protestantism into several parties or factions, and were first officially determined by the Symbols of the latter part of the sixteenth century and those of the seventeenth century.*

The Reformation had in itself the seeds of numerous controversies, which soon divided the reformers into parties, waging as bitter war with one another as they did with the Roman authorities. There soon arose three great divisions in the Protestant world, the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Anglican; all organising themselves into national Churches.

But within these Churches themselves there soon arose bitter controversies as to matters of doctrine and institution. These controversies were in part officially decided by another set of Symbols.

We shall have to consider these in the order:

(1) The Lutheran Formula of Concord.

(2) Symbol of the Reformed Synod of Dort.

(3) The Presbyterian Westminster Confession.

It is necessary to consider for all these Symbols the circumstances of their origin, and in some cases certain minor symbols that prepared the way for them.

There are some writers who include under the Symbols the doctrinal deliverances of Anabaptists and other revolutionary sects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but this is a widening of the discipline beyond the range of historic Christianity. No sect, even if it claims to be Christian, and more truly such than the historic Churches, may be regarded as entitled to the claim merely because it holds to some distinctive Christian principles. Such sects, so far as they have organised themselves into religious societies rejecting some of the historic Institutions of Christianity, and have issued statements of doctrine in antagonism with the historical Faith of the Church, can only be regarded as schismatic and heretical. Their symbols, so far as they have any, cannot be regarded as belonging to the discipline of Christian Symbolics.

§ 3. *The Formula of Concord officially decides ten questions as to* (1) *original sin;* (2) *synergism;* (3) *the righteousness of justification;* (4) *good works;* (5) *the use of the Law;* (6) *the Eucharist;* (7) *the human nature of Christ;* (8) *the descent into Hades;* (9) *rites and ceremonies;* (10) *predestination.*

The chief heroes of the Lutheran Reformation were Luther and Melanchthon; the former aggressive, thoroughgoing, and inclined to radical methods, and withal somewhat opinionated; the latter, mild, gentle, more comprehensive in his scholarship, and irenic in his disposition. Luther and

Melanchthon maintained their friendship notwithstanding these differences; but after the death of Luther his more radical pupils came into conflict with Melanchthon and his pupils, all the more that Melanchthon himself after the death of Luther felt himself freer in his own position and more independent of Luther in his teaching and actions. Moreover, there were other influences, more or less independent of both Luther and Melanchthon, which greatly complicated the situation. The conflict raged over a good part of the field of dogma; but especially as to (1) original sin; (2) synergism, or the share of man in his conversion; (3) the righteousness of justification; (4) good works; (5) the use of the Law; (6) the Eucharist; (7) the human nature of Christ; (8) the descent into Hades; (9) rites and ceremonies; (10) predestination.

These are given in the order in which they are discussed in the *Formula of Concord* of 1577–80.

This Formula was the result of a long-continued effort on the part of a number of able divines under the patronage of the Elector Augustus of Saxony and other princes. Many conferences were held—at Frankfort, 1558; Naumburg, 1561; Altenburg, 1568; Wittenberg, 1569; Zerbst, 1570; Dresden, 1571—but without success, owing to the violent spirit of faction that existed. After the death of Flacius (1575) and other extremists, these conferences were resumed. Three formulas for the settlement of the differences were proposed in rapid succession: (1) *the Swabian and Saxon* by Andreae in 1574, revised by Chemnitz and Chytraeus in 1575; (2) *the Maulbronn* in 1575, by the Swabians Lucas Osiander and Bidembach, approved by a convention of Lutheran princes at Lichtenberg in 1576; (3) on the basis of these, *the Torgau Book*, prepared by Andreae and Chemnitz, and approved by a convention of divines in 1576. Taking these previous efforts as a basis, six divines, Andreae of Tübingen, Chemnitz of Brunswick, Selnecker of Leipzig, Musculus of Frankfort, Cornerus of Frankfort, and Chytræus of Rostock, prepared the *Bergen Formula*, which, after three years of con-

sideration, was signed and published at Dresden, June 25, 1580, on the fiftieth anniversary of the *Augsburg Confession*, and issued in one volume with the previous Lutheran Symbols as *The Book of Concord*. The design was irenic. It was to solve the questions in debate, and bring reconciliation and peace to the Lutheran Churches.

The same method was pursued as in all previous efforts of the kind, to make peace and union by authoritative decisions of the controversies. This is evident from the heading of the *Epitome* to the *Formula of Concord:* "Epitome of the Articles touching which controversies have arisen among the divines of the Augsburg Confession, which in the following restatement have been in godly wise, according to the express word of God, set forth and reconciled."

Then comes: "Of the Compendious Rule and Norm, according to which all dogmas ought to be judged, and all controversies which have arisen ought to be piously set forth and settled."

This Rule consists of the Holy Scripture. Other writings are only witnesses. These are:

(1) The Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds.

(2) The Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Smalcald Articles.

(3) Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms.

The result was temporarily and in part successful for the most of the Lutheran princes and nations, but (1) it was refused by an important minority of princes and nations; (2) its authority in others could only be enforced by pains and penalties of persecution; and (3) it accelerated the movement of others toward the Reformed Church, so that the Lutherans soon lost the Palatinate (1583), Anhalt (1588), Zweibrücken (1588), Hanau (1596), Hesse (1604), and Brandenburg (1614).

Each question in dispute is considered and decided in the order given above.

The literature of the *Book of Concord* is immense. The Latin title is *Concordia*, the German sometimes *Evangelisches Concordienbuch*, but usually *Christliches Concordienbuch*. The *Concordia* was first published

at Leipzig by Selnecker in 1580, the second standard edition by command of the Elector, in 1584; numerous subsequent editions were published depending upon it. German editions were issued in 1580 at Dresden, Magdeburg, and Tübingen, frequently later there and elsewhere. Translations were made into Dutch in 1715, and Swedish 1730, and into English 1851, at Newmarket, Va. The history and interpretation of the *Formula of Concord* is given in connection with studies of the *Concordia*, among which we may mention: Rechenberg, 1677; Pipping, 1703, 1739; Baumgarten, 1747; J. G. Walch, 1750; and the Theological Faculty of Leipzig, 1760.

Of special works on the Formula itself we may mention the following: *Epistola ministrorum in Belgio ad authores libri Bergensis qui etiam Concordia dicitur*, 1579; Ursinus, *de libro concordiae*, 1581; *Apologia oder Verantwortung d. christl. Concordienbuchs*, 1583; *Bericht d. Theologen und Universitaten, Leipzig, Wittenberg und Jena*, 1586; Hospinian, R., *Concordia discors*, 1607; Hutter, L., *Concordia concors*, 1614; Musaeus, J., *Praelectiones in epitomen Formulae Concordiae*, 1701; Balthasar, J. H., *Historie d. Torgischen Buchs*, 1741–56; Anton, J. N., *Gesch. d. Concordienformel*, 1779; Heppe, H. L. J., *Der Text d. Bergischen Concordienformel, vergl. mit d. Text d. schwäbischen Concordie u. s. w.* 1857–60; *Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel*, 1858–9; Göschel, K. F., *Die Concordienformel nach ihrer Geschichte*, 1858; Frank, F. H. R., *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, 1858–65; for additional earlier literature *v.* Koecher, *Bibl. Theologiae Symbolicae*, 1751, pp. 118 *seq.*

§ 4. *Several Confessions of a Melanchthonian type were composed on the basis of the variable form of the Augsburg Confession, tending more or less toward a milder Calvinism, or with the purpose of uniting Lutherans and Calvinists in a common Faith.*

The sterner doctrinal decisions of the Formula of Concord were not agreeable to all the Protestant theologians and governments of Germany, and the bitter controversies between the Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Melanchthonian theologians were destroying the peace and unity of the countries. Therefore a number of local Confessions arose of a milder character.*

A Confession was drawn up by Superintendent Amling and others for submission to a conference in Cassel, in 1579.

* Heppe, *Die Bekenntniss-Schriften der reformierten Kirchen Deutschlands*, 1860, gives nine minor Confessions of local interest.

It was adopted and became official for the duchy of Anhalt in 1581. It is based on the variable form of the Augsburg Confession. In 1597 another Confession of Anhalt was adopted of a more Calvinistic character. In 1607 a general Synod at Cassel adopted a Hessian Confession for electoral Hesse, of a mildly Calvinistic type.

A Confession was prepared by the Melanchthonian Pezel, and adopted by the Synod of Dillenburg as official for Nassau in 1578.

The Bremen Consensus was also prepared by Pezel, and adopted as official for the free city of Bremen in 1595. It tends more in a Calvinistic direction than the Confession of Nassau.

The Bentheim Confession was drawn up in 1613, and is of a mildly Calvinistic type.

§ 5. *Three Confessions of an irenic character were prepared for Brandenburg, to unite the Lutherans and Calvinists in a common Faith.**

The first of these is the Confession of Sigismund, of 1614. John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg (Christmas, 1613), made a public profession of the Reformed Faith in the Dome at Berlin with a number of his representative subjects, and in May, 1614, issued a brief Confession of Faith prepared by Pelargus, General Superintendent of Frankfort on the Oder, of an irenic character, accepting the ecumenical Creeds and Councils of the ancient Church and the variable form of the Augsburg Confession, but with a moderate Calvinistic doctrine of the sacraments and of divine grace.

The second of these Confessions was that of the *Colloquy* of Leipzig (1631), arranged by the Elector of Brandenburg,

* *Die drey Confessiones . . . Brandenburg.* 1695; Zorn, *Historia derer zwischen den Lutherischen und Reformirten Theologen gehaltenen Colloquiorum*, 1705; Hering, D. H., *Hist. Nachricht von dem ersten Anfang d. evang.-reformirten Kirche in Brandenburg und Preussen. . . . nebst den drei Bekenntniss-Schriften dieser Kirche*, 1778; *Neue Beiträge*, 1787; *Acta conventus Thoruniensis celebrati*, 1645; Calovius, *Historia Syncretistica*, 1685.

Christian William, and the Elector George of Saxony. The Reformed divines were John Bergius, the Court chaplain, Crocius, and Theophilus Neuberger. The Lutheran divines were Hoë of Hoënegg, Leyser, and Höpfner. The variable form of the Augsburg Confession was taken as a basis, and they agreed on all questions except those concerning the omnipresence of Christ's human nature, oral manducation in the Eucharist, and the doctrine of predestination. The result of the conference was to determine the consensus and limit the dissensus to a very few minor questions.

The third of these Confessions was the Declaration of Thorn, 1645. This colloquy was arranged by Wladislaus, King of Poland, to heal the divisions of his subjects and to renew the union in the Consensus of Sendomir, 1570, and the *Pax dissidentium*, 1573. The Roman Catholic deputies refused concessions. The Reformed had twenty-four delegates, including John Bergius. The Moravians were represented by their Bishop Amos Comenius, the Lutherans by twenty-eight members, especially Calovius and Hülsemann, strict Lutherans, and the irenic George Calixtus. The colloquy failed in its purpose. Each party made its own statement. Only the declaration of the Reformed gained symbolical significance, because of its adoption by Brandenburg. It accepts the ecumenical Creeds and Councils of the ancient Church, the variable form of the Augsburg Confession, and the Consensus of Sendomir.

These three documents became the Symbols of Faith for Brandenburg, and are the basis of all the subsequent reunion movements in Germany.

§ 6. *The Synod of Dort was convened as a body representing the various national Churches of the Reformed type to decide the controversy between the Arminians and the stricter Calvinists. Its Canons define the five points of scholastic Calvinism.*

The Reformation, so far as it was not dominated by Luther, was of the Swiss type, which began with Zwingli, but which, under the influence of a number of leaders in different govern-

ments, assumed a variety of expressions in several national Confessions. These agreed in the main; but, nevertheless, there were important variations. The milder Augustinianism of Zwingli passed over into the sterner Augustinianism of Calvin, and especially of Beza. Beza is the real father of scholastic Calvinism, rather than Calvin himself. Beza dominated the Churches of Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland; but the Augustinianism of the Reformed Churches of France and Germany, and of the Church of England remained of a milder type. However, the Puritan party in England and even some of their stout opponents were high Augustinians.

There was considerable danger of conflict in the Reformed Churches because of the diversity of nationalities and interests represented in the Reformed camp by such a large number of different Confessions of Faith; but the representative leaders strove to keep them united in battle array against Romanists and Lutherans. An early effort of this kind was the *Harmonia Confessionum Fidei Orthodoxarum et Reformatarum Ecclesiarum*, of Salnar, Geneva, 1581; translated into English at Cambridge, 1586; at London, 1643, as *Harmony of the Confessions of Faith of the Christian and Reformed Churches;* new edition by Peter Hall, 1842.

Another effort of the same kind was made by Laurentius in his *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum Fidei*, 1612; new edition, 1654.

The Reformed doctrinal system soon became known on the basis of Calvin's *Institutes* as the *Calvinistic System*. This emphasises the divine side of theology, whereas the Lutheran system emphasises the human side. The Calvinistic scholastics, under the impulse of Beza, exaggerated *the divine sovereignty*, and especially the *divine sovereign decree;* and attempted to analyse the divine decree, by a use of the Aristotelian logic, into an order of decrees and a corresponding order of salvation.

Calvinists soon divided upon the order of the divine decrees into two parties, the *Supralapsarians* and the *Infralapsarians*. The order of the divine decrees is most elaborately

worked out by Wm. Perkins of Cambridge, in his *Armilla aurea*, 1590, *Golden Chaine*, 1591.

The Scriptural basis is Rom. 8^{28-30}:

"And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, *even* to them that are called according to *His* purpose. For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained *to be* conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first born among many brethren: and whom He foreordained, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified."

Here we have a double statement in parallelism:

I. *Purpose, calling, work for good;*

II. *Foreknew, foreordained, called, justified, glorified.*

Neither of these is complete, however. What relation has foreknowledge to foreordination? The High Calvinists maintained that the foreknowledge here was the pregnant foreknowledge of the divine purpose, and not simple foreknowledge; and that foreknowledge was not "the moving or efficient cause of predestination, but solely and alone '*the good-will and pleasure of God.*'" On the other hand, it was maintained that predestination was based upon an antecedent foreknowledge. Upon this distinction everything depended. The fall of mankind is not included in this order. Where does it come in this order? The usual Calvinistic order puts the election after the fall, and is Infralapsarian; there are other theologians who put it before, and are Supralapsarian.

The order of Infralapsarianism is:

Creation, Permission of Fall, Election, Reprobation;

of Supralapsarianism:

Election and Reprobation, Creation, Fall.

This extreme Calvinism was opposed by Baro, in *Prælect. in Ionam Prophetam*, 1579, and *Concio ad Clerum*, 1595; and by William Barrett of Caius College, *Concio ad Clerum*, 1595. To settle this controversy the *Lambeth Articles* were prepared in 1595. These were never ratified by the Church of England or the Crown of England, and are altogether unoffi-

cial. All efforts to enforce them were prevented by Elizabeth and her ministers. There are nine Articles, which are Infralapsarian:

(1) There is a double decree of predestination unto life and reprobation.

(2) The predestination and reprobation are not preceded by foreknowledge; but are due to the divine sovereign pleasure.

(3) The number of the elect and the reprobate is definite, and cannot be increased or diminished.

(4) The elect will certainly be saved; the reprobate are certainly lost.

(5) Saving grace is only given to the elect; and it is not in the will or power of every one to be saved.

The *Irish Articles* of 1615 incorporated the *Lambeth Articles*, to all intents and purposes. And yet the milder Augustinianism continued in England during all this period.

The *Golden Chaine* of Perkins stirred up controversy not only in England, but all over the Calvinistic world. Arminius, an able theologian of Holland, came into such preeminence in the controversy which began about him and his disciples, that his name was given to all subsequent forms of the milder Augustinianism in the Reformed Churches. Arminius was professor of theology at Leyden, 1603–9. He came into conflict not only with the Supralapsarianism of Gomarus, but also with Perkins; and maintained, as he thought, the most natural interpretation of Rom. 7–8.

After his death, Episcopius, professor at Leyden, and Uytenbogaert, preacher at the Hague, the statesman Barneveldt, and Hugo Grotius, the greatest scholar of his age, gave their weight to the milder Augustinianism in Holland. The Arminians formulated their view in five articles drawn up by Uytenbogaert, which were signed by forty-six ministers, and laid as a *Remonstrance* before the representatives of Holland and West Friesland in 1610. This was replied to by Gomarus and his party. This introduction of the political element imbittered the controversy; and so the *States General*

summoned a national Synod at Dort. The foreign Reformed Churches were invited to send three or four divines each. The Synod assembled on November 13, 1618, and continued in session till May 9, 1619. Scotland, England, the Palatinate, Hesse, Belgium, Switzerland, and a number of minor principalities were represented.

Delegates were selected for Brandenburg and France, but did not appear. The Remonstrant delegates were not allowed seats; and so they appeared only as criminals at the bar, condemned already by their opponents. The only question was as to the form and substance of the condemnation.

The most important writings on the Synod of Dort and the Remonstrants are as follows: Arminius, *Examen libelli Perkinsiani*, 1612; *Disputationes*, 1614; *opera*, 1629; English, 1825–8; *Scripta adversaria collationis Hagiensis*, 1612, 16; Barlaeus, *epistola ecclesiastarum, quos in Belgio Remonstrantes vocant*, 1617; Carlton, D., *Speech . . . touching the discord and troubles of the Church and Policie, caused by the schismaticall Doctrines of Arminius*, 1618; *Specimen controversiarum Belgicarum*, 1618; *Judicium Synodi nationalis Reformatarum ecclesiarum Belgicarum habitae Dordrechti*, 1619; Dordrecht, Heidelberg, and London in English, the same year; *Judicia theologorum provincialium, de quinque controversis Remonstrantium articulis Synodo Dordrechtanae exhibita*, Hanoviæ, 1619; Molinaeus, P., *Anatome Arminianismi*, English also, 1620; Episcopius, *Confessio seu declaratio pastorum qui Remonstrantes vocantur*, 1621, 22; *Apologia pro confessione remonstrant.* 1629; *Acta synodi nationalis . . . Dordrechti habitae . . . Accedunt plenissima de quinque articulis tam exterorum quam Provincialium theologorum judicia*, Hanoviæ, 1620; *Acta et scripta synodalia Dordracena ministrorum Remonstrantium in foederato Belgio*, 1620; Malderus, J., *Antisynodica*, 1620; *Suffragium Collegiale Theologorum Mag. Brit. de quinque controversis Remonstrantium articulis, Synodo Dordrechtanae exhibitum*, 1626, English same year; Hales, J., *Letters from Synod of Dort*, 1711, in *Golden Remains*, 1657, 1673; *Historia Concilii Dordraceni*, 1724; Works, 1765; Robinson, J., *Defence of the Doctrine propounded by the Synode at Dort*, 1624; Vedel, N., *Arcana Arminianismi*, 1632–4; Peltius, *Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum*, 1633; Calovius, A., *Consideratio Arminianismi*, 1655; Heylyn, P., *Historia Quinquarticularis*, 1660; Rutherford, S., *Examen Arminianismi*, 1668; Hickman, H., *Historia Quinque Articularis Exarticulata*, 1673; Zeltner, *Breviarium controversiarum cum Remonstrantibus agitatarum*, 1719; Graf, M., *Beyträge z. Kenntniss d. Gesch. d. Synode von Dordrecht*, 1725; Catten-

burgh, A., *Bibliotheca scriptorum Remonstrantium*, 1728; Regenboog J., *Historie der Remonstranten*, 1774–6; Scott, T., *The Articles of the Synod of Dort*, 1818; Glasius, B., *Geschiedenis d. Synode te Dordrecht*, 1860–1; Rogge, *Bibliotheek Remonstrantsche Geschriften*, 1863.

§ 7. *The French School of Saumur raised the standard of a more moderate Calvinism in what was subsequently known as New School Theology. The leaders of the school denied* (1) *verbal inspiration, especially of the Hebrew vowel points. They taught* (2) *conditional universalism in human salvation; and* (3) *the mediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. These views were rejected by the Helvetic Consensus in* 1675 *in the interests of scholastic Calvinism.*

The Synod of Dort did not define all questions in dispute in the Calvinistic Churches. In France controversy soon arose over the milder Calvinism of the School of Saumur, where three great scholars, Cappellus (1585–1658), Placeus (1596–1655), and Amyraldus (1596–1664), taught large bodies of students from many lands.

(1) Louis Cappellus, the Younger, was the most eminent Biblical scholar of his age. He showed that the Hebrew vowel points were not original, but Massoretic; and that there were different readings of the text; and thus came into conflict with the scholastic theory of verbal inspiration and an inerrant text.

(2) Amyraldus brought forth the doctrine known as *hypothetic*, or *conditional universalism*, which, indeed, had been taught by his teacher, John Cameron (1580–1625), the great Scotch divine. Amyraldus made several important distinctions: (*a*) The divine decree was double; but the foreordination to life was *efficient*, the reprobation *permissive*. (*b*) Christ died *intentionally* for all, but *efficiently* only for the elect. (*c*) Objective grace is *offered* to all, but subjective grace in the heart is *given* only to the elect. (*d*) Men have the *natural* ability to believe, but not the *moral* ability.

(3) Placeus denied the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and asserted the doctrine of *mediate imputation* as alone justifiable on moral grounds. The

reformers held to the Augustinian realism, that the human race was one in Adam, and that the race sinned in and with him; and that therefore there was a race guilt in which all shared by divine imputation, or condemnation for Adam's sin. At the close of the sixteenth century and early in the seventeenth the *federal theory* came into vogue with a revival of scholastic Nominalism. There was assumed to have been a covenant of works with Adam, on behalf of himself and all his descendants, whom he represented in this covenant relation. Thus originated the doctrine of a *forensic legal imputation* of Adam's sin, which was neither natural nor moral.

Placeus objects chiefly to the latter, and urges that the sin of Adam is imputed to us mediately, through our share in it by the inherited sinful nature.

The controversy as to these doctrines stirred not only the Churches of France, but also those of Holland, Great Britain, and Switzerland. Heidegger of Zürich, with the cooperation of Gernler of Basel and Francis Turrettin of Geneva, composed the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, in 1675, as a definition of scholastic Calvinism over against the School of Saumur. This Formula was adopted by several of the Cantons of Switzerland under the influence of these great divines, but nowhere else; and it was overthrown in Switzerland in the next generation. However, scholastic Calvinists rallied about it and maintained its doctrines in other countries, especially in Holland and Scotland; but it had little influence in Germany or England.

The official copy of the *Formula consensus* is in the archives of Zürich. It was first printed as a supplement to the Second Helvetic Confession in 1714. The writings which chiefly brought on the conflict were: Cappellus, L., *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, 1624; *Diatriba de veris et antiquis Ebraeorum litteris*, 1645; Amyraut, *Traité de la prédestination*, 1634; *Exercitatio de gratia universali*, 1646; Placeus, *De statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam*, 1640; *Disputatio de imputatione primi peccati Adami*, 1655. For the *consensus* and the controversy, *v.* Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France*, 1710; Hottinger, J. J., *Succincta et solida ac genuina Formulae consensus . . . historia*, 1723; Pfaff, C. M., *Dissertatio hist. theol. de formula consensus*

Helvetica, 1723; Barnaud, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*, 1726; Schweizer, A., *Die protestant. Centraldogmen*, 1856; Haag, E., *La France protestante*, 1889.

The Westminster Assembly

§ 8. *The Westminster Assembly composed and issued the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, the Form of Government, and the Directory for Worship, as a platform for entire British Christianity.*

The conflict between the Puritan, or Presbyterian party, and the Catholic, or Episcopal party in the British Churches continued with constantly increasing violence until it resulted in civil war.

The people of Scotland were for the most part Presbyterian. They had bishops, but these were superintendents in the Presbyterian sense rather than prelates. When Charles I and Archbishop Laud of Canterbury endeavoured to force upon the Church of Scotland royal supremacy and prelacy, the people of Scotland rebelled. The immediate occasion was the effort to compel the Church of Scotland to use a Liturgy prepared by the archbishop of Canterbury, which was more objectionable than that of the Church of England. This was resisted by the people; and the *Solemn League and Covenant* was drawn up by Alexander Henderson and Johnston of Warriston, which was signed by the great majority of nobles, ministers, and people. The king was forced to yield, and call a free General Assembly, November 21, 1638. Laud's Liturgy was rejected, and the Book of Canons he had tried to force upon the Scottish Church. The Bishops were compelled to resign; and so the Church became simply Presbyterian, governed by General Assembly alone.

The Church of Ireland was Episcopal in its organisation, but Puritan and Presbyterian in its doctrine under the influence of Travers and Archbishop Ussher. The intolerance of the crown brought about a rebellion of the Roman Catholics, who were greatly in the majority in Ireland; and all Protestants were compelled to unite against them. Accord-

ingly ecclesiastical questions went into the background, although the Irish Church was in general sympathy with the Scottish.

The English people, led by their parliament, were compelled to battle for civil and religious liberty against the king and the archbishop. This eventually resulted in civil war, in which Parliament prevailed and the chief advisers of the king, including Archbishop Laud, were beheaded as traitors to the nation.

The Long Parliament summoned an assembly of divines to meet in Westminster Abbey, July 1, 1643. Ireland and Wales, as well as all the counties of England, were represented by their ablest divines; so also the universities. The Church of Scotland sent commissioners to work with these divines with the purpose, as they said, of the "settling of the so-much-desired union of the whole Island in one forme of Church government, one confession of Faith, one common catechism, and one directory for the worship of God."

The Assembly first set to work over a revision of the *Thirty-nine Articles*. This only went as far as fifteen articles, and then, on October 12, the work was suspended, they being ordered by Parliament to "confer and treat" of the government and discipline of the Church. This was their most serious task, and where the greatest difference arose between the four parties into which they divided: (1) Episcopal, (2) Presbyterian, (3) Independent, (4) Erastian.

The draught of Church government was first sent up to parliament July 4, 1645, after two years of hard labour and discussion. In the meanwhile the Episcopalians withdrew from the Assembly, and the Independents or Dissenting Brethren, a very small minority, were overwhelmed and their congregations put under the ban, until Cromwell overturned Presbyterianism and gave them liberty and supremacy.

In the meanwhile, committees were at work upon other documents. The Directory of Worship was sent up to the House of Commons, December 27, 1644, and, after it had been adopted, was by law substituted for the *Book of Com-*

mon Prayer, whose use was prohibited under severe penalties. The Independents did not quarrel with this.

The *Confession of Faith*, after a long debate, was finished November 26, 1646. Parliament required the Assembly to append proof-texts, which was done April 29, 1647. The Confession was not altogether satisfactory to Parliament, and was not adopted until June 20, 1648, with the omission of two chapters on *Church Censures* and on *Synods and Councils* (XXX, XXXI) and of other minor sections, which were stricken out. As thus adopted by Parliament, it was given the title *Articles of Christian Religion*.

The *Confession of Faith*, with Articles XXX and XXXI included, never received the sanction of the Parliament of England, although it was subsequently adopted in Scotland and by Presbyterian Churches generally in the form of 1647.

The *Larger Catechism* was prepared on the basis of Herbert Palmer's Catechism, and completed October 15, 1647. The *Shorter Catechism* was based on the *Larger* and completed in a month, November 16, 1647.

The Assembly were long troubled to answer nine questions propounded to them by Parliament, April 30, 1646, as to the *divine right* of Church government and discipline. This they never did, but left it to the Provincial Assembly of London, to which many of the chief divines belonged.

The Westminster Assembly of divines was in vast majority Presbyterian and Calvinistic. There were no doctrinal differences among them, except between Old School and New School Calvinists; and the statements in the Confession were a compromise acceptable to both parties.

The documents of the Westminster Assembly and the Long Parliament are the following:

(1) *Church Government. The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines . . . concerning the Doctrinal part of Ordination of Ministers*, April 19, 1644;—*concerning Church Government*, July 4, 1645. These occasioned considerable debate in Parliament and the Assembly itself. Parliament issued the following Ordinances:—*for the ordination of ministers pro tempore*, October 2, 1644; *for the electing and choosing of Ruling Elders in all the Congregations and in the Classical Assemblies for the*

cities of London and Westminster, and the several counties of the Kingdom, for the speedy settling of the Presbyterial government, August 19, 1645; —*concerning suspension from the sacrament of the Lord's supper in cases of ignorance and scandall,* October 20, 1645;—*for giving power to all the classical presbyteries within their respective bounds to examine, approve, and ordain ministers for severall congregations,* November 10, 1645; —*for keeping of scandalous persons from the sacrament of the Lord's supper, the enabling of congregations for the choice of elders, and supplying of defects in former ordinances and directions of Parliament concerning Church Government,* March 14, 1645(6);—*for the speedy dividing and settling the several counties of this kingdom into distinct classical Presbyteries and congregational eldership,* January 29, 1647(8);—and finally, *The form of Church Government to be used in the Church of England and Ireland,* August 29, 1648.

(2) *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, together with an Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and observing of this present Directory throughout the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales,* March 13, 1644(5).

(3) *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines . . . concerning a Confession of Faith,* December 4, 1646;—the same *with the Quotations and Texts of Scripture annexed,* April 26, 1647. After revision the Parliament published it as *Articles of Christian Religion,* June 27, 1648.

(4) *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines . . . concerning a Larger Catechism,* October 22, 1647;—the same, *with the proofs thereof out of the Scriptures,* April 12, 1648. *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines . . . concerning a Shorter Catechism,* November 25, 1647. Parliament finally adopted it under the title: *The Ground and Principles of Religion,* 1648.

(5) *The Jus Divinum.* The Assembly did not itself respond to this question. The Provincial Assembly of London took this off their hands in two large papers: *A Vindication of the Presbyterian Government,* 1649; and *Jus Divinum ministerii evangelici,* 1653; *v.* Briggs, *Provincial Assembly of London* (*Presbyterian Review,* January, 1881).

The Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and America have adopted the final standards of the Westminster Assembly itself in all subsequent editions rather than the forms adopted by the English Parliament.

The literature on the Westminster Assembly is abundant. The documentary is as follows: *Journals of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines convened for the work of Reformation in the Church by the authority of Parliament,* by John Lightfoot, pub. in *Works,* XIII, ed. Pitman, 1825. These journals extend from the opening July 1, 1643, until December 31, 1644. *Notes of the Debates and Proceedings of the*

Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster, by George Gillespie, pub. in the *Presbyterian Armoury*, II, 1846, from the Wodrow MSS. in the Advocate's Library, Edinburgh. *Minutes of the Sessions of the Assembly of Divines*, 3 v., folio, MSS. in the Williams Library, London; transcript in the Kirk Library, Edinburgh. Vol. III alone has been published: *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (November, 1644, to March, 1649), ed. Mitchell-Struthers, Edin., 1874. There was not sufficient interest in this volume in the entire Presbyterian world to secure the publication of the other volumes. *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, ed. David Laing, 3 v., Edin., 1841. *Records of the Commissions of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland*, 1646–9, ed. Mitchell and Christie, 1892–6. There are besides the Ordinances, Declarations and Directions of the Long Parliament of England, and several hundred vols. of writings by members of the Westminster Assembly and their opponents, the most of which are in the British Museum, and in the *McAlpin Collection* of the Union Theological Seminary, New York; *v.* Briggs, *Documentary History of the Westminster Assembly* (*Presbyterian Review*, January, 1880); *American Presbyterianism*, 1885, pp. 61 *seq.;* Reid, J., *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster*, 1811–15; Mitchell, A. F., *The Westminster Assembly, its History and Standards*, 1883.

The Arminians were not represented in the Westminster Assembly. These were chiefly Episcopal divines, adherents of the Laudian party; although there were a few Arminians among the Baptists and other smaller Christian societies not represented in the Assembly. The differences between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians were decided in the Assembly against the Episcopalians.

In this negative position the Independents agreed.

But the Independents dissented from the Presbyterians upon church government and discipline; and so, in 1658, representatives of one hundred and twenty Congregational Churches issued the *Savoy Declaration*. This Declaration agrees with the *Westminster Confession* in all strictly doctrinal matters, but not in ecclesiastical or disciplinary matters. It omits Chapters XXX and XXXI, as Parliament had done, inserts as XX a new chapter on the *Gospel*, slightly modifies Chapters XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI, and adds a section on the *Institution of Churches* in thirty Propositions.

Previous to this, in 1648, the New England Churches assembled in the *Cambridge Synod*, had expressed agreement with the *Westminster Confession* except in Chapters XXV, XXX, and XXXI, which were replaced by the *Cambridge Platform.*

A Platform of Church-Discipline gathered out of the Word of God, and agreed upon by the Elders and Messengers of the Churches assembled in the Synod at Cambridge in N. E., 1649; *A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England; agreed upon and consented unto by their elders and messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October* 12, 1658; *Confession of Faith—Heads of Agreement* and *Articles for the administration of Church Discipline* (Saybrook Platform), 1710; Dexter, H. M., *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years as seen in its Literature*, 1880; Walker, W., *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, 1893.

The Baptist Confession of 1677, 1688, 1689, known in America as *the Confession of Philadelphia*, adopted September 25, 1742, also adheres to the *Westminster Confession*, except in the Articles on the *Church* and the *Sacraments*. In the matter of Church government it agrees with the *Savoy Declaration*, but in the Article on *Baptism* it stands apart. This Confession, however, represented only the *Particular* or *Calvinistic Baptists*. The Baptists have also their Arminian division, due to their connection with the Holland Arminianists. These issued a *London Confession* of twenty-five Articles in 1660.

A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith, set forth by many of us who are (falsely) called Ana-baptists, to inform all men (in these dayes of scandal and reproach) of our innocent Belief and Practice, London, 1660; *A Confession of Faith put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians, Baptised upon Profession of their Faith, in London and the Country*, 1677, 1688, 1689; Underhill, *Confessions of Faith and other Public Documents illustrative of the History of the Baptist Churches of England in the Seventeenth Century*, 1854; McGlothlin, W. J., *Baptist Confessions*, 1867 [1911]; Nicholas, J. S., *History of Baptism*, 1678; Crosby, Thos., *History of the English Baptists*, 1740; Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, 1811–30; Barclay, R., *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 1879.

CHAPTER VI

ROMAN CATHOLIC SYMBOLS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

§ 1. *The Church of Rome issued many papal condemnations of error during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but no definition of the Faith and therefore no symbol.*

The Church of Rome has not ceased from issuing decisions of various kinds with reference to doctrines of Faith and Morals, as well as Institutions. Indeed there has been a steady stream of them since the Council of Trent. Denzinger gives no less than seventy-four of them. Many Protestants, as indeed many Roman Catholics, find it difficult to discriminate between them and to determine which of them, if any, is symbolical. They all have an official authority, chiefly in the rejection of errors, but few have symbolical authority as definitions of the Faith. The only ones that can have any real claim to be symbolical in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the condemnations of the five propositions of Jansen in 1653, repeated in 1656, 1664, 1705; and of the one hundred and one propositions of Paschasius Quesnel in 1713. But there is no sufficient reason to distinguish these condemnations from that of the sixty-eight propositions of Miguel de Molinos in 1687, or those of the Gallicans of 1682, and of the eighty-five propositions of the Synod of Pistoria in 1794. It is true that the questions raised by the Jansenists were more important from a doctrinal point of view, and that they caused a prolonged conflict in the Church; but there are in these official decisions only negative condemnations, and not positive definitions of the Faith such as alone are symbolical. And indeed prior to 1870 no Council of the Church ascribed

symbolical character to any papal decision whatsoever. It is true that the Society of Jesus was zealous for the prerogative of the Pope in giving final determinations of Faith; and that Order was most active in procuring the condemnation of the Jansenists with the resulting schism in the Church. But the most of the other Orders and the Episcopate in general were not in sympathy with theories of papal absolutism.

The Jansenists were driven out of France, but established themselves in Holland with their centre at Utrecht, where they have maintained an honourable existence until the present time, protesting their innocence of heresy or schism, and maintaining the genuine Catholic tradition based on the Council of Trent.

The Chief Literature of Jansenism is the following: Jansenius, Cornelius, *Augustinus*, 3 v., Louvain, 1640; Paris, 1641; Gale, T., *The True Idea of Jansenisme*, 1669; Leydecker, M., *Historia Jansenismi*, 1695; Quesnel, *Le Nouveau Testament en françois avec des réflexions morales*, 1692; Gerberon, *Histoire générale de Jansénisme*, 1700; Lucchesinus, J. L., *Jansenianorum hæresi enchiridion*, 1705; *Hist. Polem. Jansenismi*, 1711; *Constitution (Unigenitus) Clement XI*, 1713; Dubois, R. J., *Collectio nova actorum Constit. Unigenitus*, 1725; Colonia, Dom. de, *Dict. des livres Jansénistes*, 1732; *Bibliothèque Janséniste*, 1735; Fontaine, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Porte-Royal*, 1738; Bellegarde, D. de, *Hist. de l'église métrop. d'Utrecht*, 1784, 1852[3]; Augusti, *Das Erzbisthum Utrecht*, 1838; Reuchlin, H., *Gesch. von Port-Royal*, 1839–44; Tregelles, S. P., *The Jansenists*, 1851; Guettée, R. F. W., *Jansénisme et Jésuitisme*, 1857; Neale, J. M., *History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 1857; Van Wyk, J. A. G., *Hist. eccl. Ultraject.*, 1859; Ricard, A., *Les Premiers Jansénistes*, 1883; Séche, L., *Les derniers Jansénistes*, 1891; Huller, J. de, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het Utrechtsche Schisma*, 1892.

The Society of Jesus accomplished a great work of reform in the Roman Church during the sixteenth century in education in the doctrines and institutions of the Church, so long as the spirit of the founders prevailed; but like all human institutions it had within itself the seeds of corruption, which in the seventeenth century became malignant, and which in the eighteenth century brought about the expulsion of the

Order from most Catholic countries and its abolition by the Pope in 1773. Undoubtedly this, like all persecution, was really beneficial to the Order. After its purgation, it was restored in 1814 by Pius VII, who greatly needed its aid in the revival and reform of the Church after the disorders of the French Revolution and the Empire of Napoleon. During the past hundred years the Society of Jesus has steadily gained importance notwithstanding frequent conflicts with the civil powers.

Just as in the early Church the monastic orders strove to make the entire Christian ministry monastic, and impose monastic ideals upon the people of the Church; just as the mendicant orders strove for the same ideal in the Middle Ages; so in modern times the Society of Jesus has laboured without ceasing to Jesuitise the Church, to shape her piety and institutions, to formulate her doctrines of Faith and Morals, and to dominate her education, her discipline, and her relation to the civil governments. The inevitable result has been unceasing conflict in Church and State, with the demoralisation of the Order itself into a mere autocratic machine, in which the vital godliness, the consecration to the glory of God, and the self-sacrificing service of Christ, characteristic of its founders, have too often been depressed or crushed.

§ 2. *Pope Pius X, in* 1854, *after securing the well-nigh unanimous consent of the Roman Catholic Church, defined the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of Christ as an infallible dogma of the Church.*

The modern symbolic movement in the Church of Rome began under the instigation of the Jesuits, when Pius IX in 1854, in his Bull *Ineffabilis Deus,* defined the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of our Lord. The Pope, in an encyclical letter, invited the bishops throughout the world to give their opinion as to whether the Apostolic See should define the doctrine. More than six hundred bishops answered, all in favour of the definition except four who dis-

sented from the doctrine, and fifty-two who thought its definition inexpedient or inopportune. Accordingly, on December 8, the definition was solemnly made in St. Peter's, Rome, as follows:

"Beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suæ conceptionis fuisse singulari omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpae labe preservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam."

It must be said that the Catholic world was consulted before the definition was made to a much greater extent than ever before in history, and that an extraordinary consensus of the Church in favour of the doctrine had been attained; all the more surprising in view of the long differences between the Franciscans and Dominicans on this subject, and the rejection of the doctrine by many of the most authoritative theologians of former ages. Undoubtedly it was the zealous activity of the Jesuit Order which brought about the inquiry and the final papal definition of this important and popular doctrine. And so that definition greatly enhanced the papal prerogative and the influence of the Society of Jesus, and prepared the way for the definition of papal infallibility by the Vatican Council.

The consensus of the Early Church was that the virginity of Mary was perpetual, and that she was free from actual sin. In these phases of the doctrine Pelagius agreed with Augustine, and the East with the West. There were few dissenting voices to either of these propositions. When the doctrine of original sin became prominent after Augustine, the theologians were troubled to see how Christ, as born of Mary, could escape its contamination and guilt. The great Scholastics generally agreed with Thomas Aquinas that Mary was sanctified in the womb of her mother after the infusion of the soul, and that she was further sanctified in the conception of our Lord. Duns Scotus, the great Franciscan, first shaped the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which

subsequently became a doctrine of the Franciscans. The difference of opinion on this subject still persisted in the sixteenth century; and so the Council of Trent went no further than reservation in statement of the doctrine of original sin, that it was not intended to "comprehend in this decree the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary" (Sess. V : 5). The Jesuit Order in 1593, in a General Assembly, adopted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and from that time the Order has been most zealous in its promotion.

Protestant theologians find it necessary to separate the Son of Mary from original sin. They do it by various theories, chiefly by that of her sanctification in the act of conception. But it is difficult to see how that alone could accomplish the purpose. In any case it is necessary to say that no positive evidence for the doctrine can be found in Holy Scripture; it can only be proved from the implications of other doctrines. The doctrine originated from the necessity of eliminating the Son of Mary from original sin, and the difficulty of doing it in any other way than by the elimination of original sin from his Mother Mary. When that took place, whether in her own conception or afterward, or whether in her conception of Jesus, remained an open question until the definition of Pius IX.

The most important Literature is the following: Turrecremata, J., *Tract. de veritate conceptionis beatissimae virginis*, 1547; Launoius, *Praescriptione de conceptu B. Mariae Virginis*, 1677[2]; Perrone, J., *De immaculato . . . Mariae conceptu*, 1847, 1848, 1853, 1854, German, 1849; Passaglia, C., *De immaculato . . . virginis conceptu*, 1854–5; Denzinger, H., *Die Lehre von der unbefleckten Empfängniss der seligsten Jungfrau*, 1855; Ullathorne, W. B., *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, 1855; Gratry, A., *Le mois de Marie de l'immaculée conception*, 1873; Roskovány, A. de, *Beata Virgo Maria in suo conceptu immaculata ex monumentis . . . demonstrata*, 9 v., 1873–81.

§ 3. *The Council of the Vatican in* 1870 *defined the relation of Faith and Reason over against Pantheism and Rationalism, assigning to each its distinct office and asserting their entire harmony when rightly used and understood.*

The definition of the Immaculate Conception was only the beginning of a series of doctrinal decisions by the Roman Church. The first of these was the Papal Syllabus of errors of 1864, which was issued together with an Encyclical, *Quanta Cura*. These errors were chiefly those of Pantheism, Naturalism, Rationalism, absolute and moderate, Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism, Socialism, and Communism.

Protestants would agree for the most part in the rejection of these errors. But the rejection of Bible Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies, so-called errors concerning the Church and her rights, civil society, natural and Christian ethics, marriage, the civil power of the Roman pontiff, and modern Liberalism, raised many questions upon the determination of which Protestants and Roman Catholics are not agreed, and about which there were differences of opinion in the Roman Church itself.

Protestant scholars have made a great mistake in regarding this syllabus of errors as symbolical. It is no more symbolical than many other catalogues of error issued by the Popes from time to time. These give no definition of Faith and are not symbolical. That is the opinion of the ablest Roman Canonists and of Pope Pius X himself.

This syllabus was preliminary to the summons by the Pope of the Council of the Vatican by his Encyclical *Æterni Patris* in 1868. The Council opened December 8, 1869. It continued in session until November 11, 1870, when it adjourned on account of the unfavourable political situation of Europe. It will probably resume its labours at a more favourable opportunity, for its work was not completed. The Council adopted two decrees: the first, *the Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith* (April 24); the second, *the First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ* (July 18).

The Constitution of the Christian Faith has four Chapters: (I) of God, the Creator of all things, (II) of Revelation, (III) of Faith, (IV) of Faith and Reason; with several Canons supplementing each chapter. This decree defines the Faith chiefly over against Pantheism and Rationalism. The Symbols of

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were not called upon to meet this issue, and, therefore, made no definition of the relations of Faith and Reason, or of their relation to God and Revelation. In this respect the decree is an important advance in the symbolical definition of the Church. Apart from uncharitable reference to Protestantism, thinly veiled in the Preamble, and from certain unprotestant exaltations of papal and ecclesiastical authority, and ecclesiastical tradition, Protestant Churches would agree with them in substance. It cannot be maintained with regard to the symbolical statements of a Council that preambles, circumstantial statements, evidences adduced, their rhetoric or their logic, are symbolically authoritative, but only the definitions themselves. With these qualifications, Protestantism can make no valid objection to this Decree. The Protestant Churches themselves ought to have faced these burning questions of the nineteenth century, and made symbolical statements which could not have differed appreciably from those of the Council of the Vatican. As it is, the Protestant Churches either insist upon their symbols, without interposing any barrier between them and the Pantheistic and Rationalistic theories which undermine them, or else abandon their symbols and give Pantheism and Rationalism free range in their midst.

The definitions in Chapters I, II, III are simply reaffirmations of the Faith, especially over against modern Pantheistic and Rationalistic ideas. Chapter IV gives the real advance in definition by its distinction between the relative spheres of Faith and Reason.

"The Catholic Church, with one consent, has also ever held and does hold that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct both in principle and also in object; in principle, because our knowledge in the one is by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith; in object, because, besides those things to which natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known."

"But although faith is above reason, there can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals

mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind; and God cannot deny Himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth. The false appearance of such a contradiction is mainly due, either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the inventions of opinion having been taken for the verdicts of reason. We define, therefore, that every assertion contrary to a truth of enlightened faith is utterly false."

"And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to the other; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine; while faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method; but, while recognizing this just liberty, it stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of faith.

"For the doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been proposed, like a philosophical invention, to be perfected by human ingenuity, but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared. Hence, also, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is perpetually to be retained which our holy mother the Church has once declared; nor is that meaning ever to be departed from, under the pretence or pretext of a deeper comprehension of them. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and all times, increase and flourish in abundance and vigor; but simply in its own proper kind, that is to say, in one and the same doctrine, one and the same sense, one and the same judgment."

If a Protestant Assembly of divines had understood these careful distinctions, they would not, by denying that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority,* have exposed themselves to the deliverance of Canon II: 1.

* *V.* Briggs, *Authority of Holy Scripture*, pp. 26 *seq.*; *Bible, Church, and Reason*, pp. 29 *seq.*; *Church Unity*, pp. 221 *seq.*; *Defence of Professor Briggs*, pp. 45 *seq.*

"If any one shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things: let him be anathema."

§ 4. *The Vatican Council also asserted the infallibility of the Pope when* ex cathedra, *as the pastor of all Christians, he defines a doctrine of Faith or Morals to be held by the whole Church.*

The First Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ, apart from preamble, circumstantial matter, evidences, and other details, defines the Catholic Faith as follows:

"We therefore teach and declare that, according to the testimony of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was immediately and directly promised and given to blessed Peter the Apostle by Christ the Lord."

"Whence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See, does by the institution of Christ Himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church."

"Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman pontiff."

"And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling œcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the sacred Scriptures and Apostolic traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles."

"Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the

exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."

This decree was challenged by many of the ablest historians and Canonists in the Roman Catholic Church, as well as by Protestants, Greeks, and Orientals, as unhistorical and against the Canon Law of the Church. It was resisted for a long time in the Council by a considerable number of eminent prelates, partly on that account and partly as an inopportune decree; but when the final vote was taken, there were but two negative voices, and these immediately gave in their adhesion, so that the decision was legally unanimous.

Those who resisted the decree as inopportune could not sustain themselves against such an overwhelming majority, and soon submitted. The few who held out because it was unhistorical, or uncanonical, also eventually yielded as Hefele, not because he had changed his opinions, but for the sake of the peace and unity of the Church. Indeed, it was to them more of an academic than a vital question. Those who held to the infallibility of ecumenical Councils could not hold out, after an ecumenical Council had infallibly decreed the infallibility of the Pope. Those who held that the Council of Trent was an infallible ecumenical Council could not successfully maintain that the Council of the Vatican was not. While Protestants, Greeks, and Orientals sympathised with those eminent Roman Catholic scholars, who retired or were driven from the Church of Rome because they would not yield their convictions against papal infallibility, and formed the Old Catholic Church, they could not altogether vindicate the consistency of their action.

The polemic against the decree of Papal Infallibility by Old Catholics and Protestants usually overshot the mark, because of the failure to take account of the limitations of the definition and the great care with which it had been composed.

According to the best authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, oral and written, the definition may be interpreted as follows:*

(1) Infallibility is limited to "*a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals.*"

(2) Infallibility of doctrines regarding Faith and Morals is limited to those "*to be held by the whole Church.*"

(3) Infallibility is limited to a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals "*which the Roman Pontiff defines.*"

(4) Infallibility is not in the definition of the Pope as a person, but in the Pope as an official "*when discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians.*"

(5) Infallibility is limited to definitions of doctrine "*divinely revealed in Holy Scripture and in apostolic tradition.*"

(6) The infallibility of the definition is limited to the *doctrine itself*, and does not extend to the introduction, or to circumstantial details, or to evidence adduced, or to the rhetoric or logic of the decree, or the merely verbal formula of the definition.

When these limitations are considered, it is vain to adduce the case of Honorius as an historic example that disproves the dogma; for the case of Honorius was well known to those who framed the definition, and had been thoroughly discussed before the definition was made; and it is altogether probable that the definition took full account of it.†

It is indeed a most remarkable fact that the only pope in more than eighteen centuries of the papacy, who can be adduced as a case in point against the dogma, is just this

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 226 *seq.*

† I have already shown, in connection with his condemnation by the Church, that his heresy does not conflict with this Vatican definition (*v. Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 317).

Honorius; all the more extraordinary when one reflects upon the number of heretics condemned by the Church in the great Sees of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. It gives the presumption in favour of the claim that the word of Jesus to St. Peter has in fact been fulfilled in all the popes: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (Luke 22^{31-32}).

The following are the most important works on the Council of the Vatican:

1869

Actes et histoire du Concile œcuménique de Rome, premier du Vatican, 1869-70; *Officielle Actenstücke zu dem von . . . Pius IX nach Rom berufen. Oekumen. Concil,* Berlin (*zweite Sammlung,* 1870); Döllinger, J. v., *Erwägungen für die Bischöfe des Conciliums über die Frage der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit;* Dupanloup, F., *Lettre sur le futur Concile Œcuménique;* Fessler, J., *Das letzte und das nächste Allgemeine Concil;* Janus, *Der Papst und das Concil* (Eng. same year); Ketteler, W. E., *Das Allgemeine Concil und seine Bedeutung;* Manning, H. E., *The Œcumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff;* Maret, H. L. C., *Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse.*

1870

Bickel, G., *Gründe für die Unfehlbarkeit des Kirchenhauptes;* Cardoni, G., *Elucubratio de dogmatica Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate ejusque Definibilitate; La dernière heure du Concile;* Döllinger, J. v., *Einige Worte über die Unfehlbarkeitsadresse;* Hergenröther, J., *Anti-Janus* (also English); *Die "Irrthümer" v. mehr als 400 Bischöfen;* Ketteler, W. E., *Die Unwahrheiten der Römischen Briefe vom Concil;* Kenrick, *Concio in Concilio Vaticano* (trans. by Bacon as *Inside View of the Vatican Council,* 1872); Manning, H. E., *The Vatican Council and its Definitions; Das Oekum. Concil. Stimmen aus Maria-Laach;* Quirinus, *Römische Briefe vom Concil* (Eng. same year); Reinkens, J. H., *Ueber päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit;* Schulte, J. F. v., *Das Unfehlbarkeitsdecret . . . geprüft;* Veuillot, L., *Rome pendant le Concile,* 1870-2; *Wiederlegung der vier unter die Väter des Concils vertheilten Brochüren gegen die Unfehlbarkeit.*

1871

Acta et Decreta Concilii Vaticani; Fessler, J., *Die wahre und die falsche Unfehlbarkeit der Päpste; Das Vatikanische Concilium;* Friedrich,

Tagebuch während des vatikanischen Konzils; Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum; Hinschius, P., *Die Stellung d. Deutsch. Staatregier. g. d. Beschlüss. d. vatikan. Koncils;* Langen, J., *Das Vatikanische Dogma von dem Universal-Episkopat,* 1871–6; Manning, H. E., *Petri privilegium;* Scheeben, M. J., *Schulte und Döllinger, gegen das Concil. Kritische Beleuchtung;* Schulte, J. F. v., *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päbste u. Bischöfe.*

Later Years

Friedberg, E., *Sammlung d. Actenstücke zum ersten vatikanischen Konzil,* 1872; Fromman, T., *Gesch. und Kritik des vaticanischen Concils,* 1872; Pressensé, E. de, *Le concile du Vatican,* 1872; Cecconi, E., *Gesch. der allg. Kirchenversammlung im Vatican,* 1873 (French, 1887); Martin, C., *Omnium Concilii Vaticani . . . documentorum collectio,* 1873; Gladstone, W. E., *Vatican Decrees,* and Schaff, P., *History of Vatican Council,* 1875; Manning, H. E., *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance,* 1875; Friedrich, J., *Gesch. des vatican. Konzils,* 1877–87; Granderath, T., *Gesch. des vatikan. Konzils,* 1903–6.

The Old Catholics

Zirngiebl, *Bericht über d. altkath. Bewegung,* 1873; *Beschlüsse der 1–4 Synod. d. Altkatholiken,* 1874–7; Schulte, J. F. v., *Der Altkatholicismus,* 1887; Friedberg, E., *Aktenstücke d. altkath. Bewegung,* 1876; Friedrich, J., *Altkatholizismus,* 1888.

§ 5. *The Vatican Council adjourned to meet again when summoned by the Pope. Leo XIII and Pius X have issued deliverances on important matters and condemnations of error, but no symbolical definition of Institutions, Faith, or Morals.*

The pontificate of Leo XIII did not produce any symbolical decision, and the Roman Church enjoyed an unusual amount of flexibility, peace external and internal, and success. The only decision of any great importance was that on the validity of Anglican Orders in the apostolical letter, *Apostolicae Curae,* 1896. This decision was made with reluctance, and only when it was forced by the agitation for the reunion of the Church of England with Rome and by the wide-spread discussion on the subject in the Church of Rome itself. This decision was not a doctrinal one but a disciplin-

ary one, as Pope Pius X said to me, and cannot be classed as infallible and symbolical.*

Pius X in the sixth year of his pontificate issued an Encyclical against Modernism with a Syllabus of sixty-five errors contained in the writings of Loisy, Tyrrel, and other Biblical, historical, and philosophical scholars.† This Encyclical and Syllabus cannot be regarded as any more symbolical and infallible than those of Pius IX, which Pius X himself declared not to be infallible. Undoubtedly there was more justification for this Encyclical and Syllabus than appeared when it was first issued. The authorities were aware of more serious departures from the Faith than any writings then published indicated, and they cannot be blamed for the censure of such heresies. But, unfortunately for the success of their attack on Modernism and its vindication before the Christian world, they made no discrimination whatever between those devout and faithful Catholics who were striving to reconcile modern thought with Catholic dogma and Catholic institution with modern methods, and those who made radical departures from the institutions and doctrines of the Church; and they instituted a system of suspicion, inquisition, and delation, which has brought the administration of justice in the Church into contempt, and has forced a large proportion of Catholic scholars to silence and retraction, or suspension, excommunication, and withdrawal from the Church. It is evident that this state of affairs cannot continue much longer without serious injury to the Church. It is devoutly to be hoped that the reaction in favour of liberty of scholarship will begin under the present pontiff and not wait for his successor.

Some years ago when the present writer said to the Pope that it was necessary, in the interest of Church Unity, that Catholic scholars should frankly and fully discuss the differences between the Churches in an irenic spirit, seeking for their

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 110 *seq.*; Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, 1912.

† *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 393 *seq.*

solution, the Pope said that "all reasonable liberty would be given." That is all that the moderate Modernists require. The radical Modernists do not desire Church Unity at all, but only full liberty to express their individual opinions.

None can tell what the future will be. There is a desire on the part of many that Pius X should define the Assumption of the Virgin, as Pius IX did her Immaculate Conception. There is a still more wide-spread desire that the Vatican Council should reassemble to continue its work on the divine Constitution of the Church, and especially to define the relation of Church and State, and maintain the independence of the Church and the pontiff of all civil authority. On the other hand, there is the dread lest such a Council would commit the Church to a still greater hostility to the modern world. If only such a Council could constitutionalise the papacy and provide for the automatic reassembling of the councils of bishops every five or ten years, it would begin a reform, which might eventually result in the removal of all the misunderstandings of the past and bring about the reunion of Christ's Church.

CHAPTER VII

PROTESTANTISM OF THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

From the last quarter of the seventeenth century onward there was a strong reaction against those types of religion which had battled with each other in the struggles of the previous years. New philosophical theories came into the field to displace the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophies, in Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, and their associates. Science made a succession of wonderful discoveries of the laws of nature unknown before. These laws of nature and the new philosophical and scientific theories conflicted with many traditions of the Church, and also seemed to undermine some of the most important doctrines of Christianity. Theologians had to face this new situation. Some scholars abandoned the historic faith of the Church and reverted to ancient heresies. Others obstinately resisted the new thought and stiffened themselves to the defence of the dogmas and institutions of the Church in their traditional form. Few tried to distinguish between tradition and history, the essential and the non-essential, the consensus and the dissensus of Christianity. Many philosophers, scientists, literary men, and politicians became unfriendly to historical Christianity, which could not easily be reconciled to their theories. Deism arose in England and for a time swept along like a flood, destroying all that was distinctive of Christianity and reducing it to a religion of nature with the human reason as the sole authority.

§ 1. *The endeavours of the Deists to replace historic Christianity by a purely natural religion and the efforts of the theo-*

logians to maintain the distinctive principles of Christianity, resulted in the discrimination between natural Religion and Revealed Religion, natural Theology and Christian Theology; and an apologetic chiefly in the form of evidences of Christianity.

The apologists at first emphasised external evidences and gave miracles and prophecy an evidential value that they had never previously had, either in the Bible itself or in the history of Theology. Miracles and Prophecy received by these apologists technical meanings, which did not correspond with their Biblical character. No historic Symbol of the Christian Church—not even the Westminster Confession—mentions miracles or prophecies, either as evidences of Christianity or as a part of the historic Faith of the Church. It was not difficult for the Deists to show the inadequacy of the evidential value of Miracles and Prophecy, and force the apologists back on the internal evidences. Unfortunately the apologists compromised the great dogmatic facts upon which the Christian religion depends, such as the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord, by classifying these Christophanies with miracles, and using them for the same evidential purpose.

Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and His Apostles came into conflict with magicians and false prophets, and warned their disciples against miracles and prophecy as such.* The Miracles and Prophecy of the Bible vindicate themselves not by their extraordinary and marvellous character, but by their religious and moral purpose. The Christian Church has always taken this attitude toward them and cannot be held responsible for the blunders of apologists. As I wrote many years ago:

> The miracles of Biblical History were not wrought in order to give modern divines evidences of the truth and reality of the Biblical religion. The prophets did not aim to give apologists proofs for the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. The miracles were wrought as acts of divine judgment and redemption. Prophecy was given to instruct men

* Deut. 13^{1-5}, 18^{14-22}; Jer. 14^{14}, 28^{5-9}; Mt. 24^{23-24}; II Thes. 2^{8-12}; Rev. 13^{12-18}. *V.* Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 23 *seq.*

in the religion of God, in order to their salvation and moral growth. The miracles were not designed to show that God was able to violate the laws of nature, to overrule or suspend them at His will. The miracles of the Bible rather show that God Himself was present in nature, directing His own laws in deeds of redemption and of judgment. The miracles are divine acts in nature. Prophecy was not designed to show that God can overrule the laws of the human mind, suspend them, or act instead of them, using man as a mere speaking-tube to convey heavenly messages to this world. Prophecy rather discloses the presence of God in man, stimulating him to use all the powers of his intellectual and moral nature in the instruction of the people of God. Miracles and prophecy in Biblical History are the signs of the presence of God in that history. He has not left that history to itself. He has not left the laws of nature and of mind to their ordinary development, but He has taken His place at the head of affairs as the Monarch of nature and the King of men to give His personal presence and superintendence to a history which is central, and dominant of the history of the world.—(Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, p. 543.)

Hume's argument against the evidential value of miracles, and Dr. McGiffert's argument * based upon it, are both alike specious. It is quite true that "Hume was really concerned primarily to destroy the apologetic value of miracles." He writes: "I own that otherwise there may possibly be miracles or violations of the usual course of nature of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony"; but he qualifies this by saying, "perhaps it will be impossible to find any such in all the records of history." This latter remark McGiffert indorses when he says: "That it cannot be historically proved that any particular event was wrought by a supernatural power with the purpose of testifying to a person's divine commission is a commonplace among historians to-day." To this I reply, such historians are not the only historians, nor are they the most learned or the most reliable. Miracles have their place in history and cannot be dislodged from it by any scepticism whatever. To ignore them discredits the historian and his history. Those who try to exclude God from history ignore the fundamental principle of the philosophy of history. As Lessing says, the history of the world is the divine education of our race.

* *Protestant Thought before Kant*, pp. 220–1.

Miracles may be explained in accordance with various theories, but they are there as "testifying to a person's divine commission" in many instances in Biblical History. It is not true that "such proof assumes a complete knowledge of all possible natural forces which may have operated to produce the event, a knowledge to which no one now thinks of pretending"; for this reason applies only to miracles as violations of laws of nature or as wrought outside of and independent of laws of nature. If they were wrought by the use of means "inexplicable in the light of our present knowledge," the argument has no force. The real question of the miracle is as to whether it was supernatural because wrought by God or a prophet inspired by God to work it; and that does not at all depend upon unusual knowledge of the laws of nature, but upon sufficient credible testimony as to the agent who wrought the miracle, not the ways and means of it. McGiffert evidently has been influenced by Hume's specious argument:

"Upon the whole then it appears that no testimony for any kind of miracle has ever amounted to a probability, much less to a proof; and that, even supposing it amounted to a proof, it would be opposed by another proof derived from the very nature of the fact which it would endeavor to establish. It is experience only which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same experience which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of experience are contrary, we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other, and embrace an opinion either on the one side or the other, with that assurance which arises from the remainder. But, according to the principle here explained, this subtraction with regard to all popular religions amounts to an entire annihilation, and therefore we may establish it as a maxim that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any such system of religion."

Hume's argument is based entirely on the conflict of two kinds of experience, a conflict which does not really exist in the miracles of Christianity, for those miracles do not claim to be contrary to the laws of nature, but only to be wrought by supernatural power. A supernatural power may use the

laws of nature, known and unknown, as certainly, as really, and as well, as any other person or cause. The significance of the Biblical miracles is this. No one at the time could work them except the prophets of God. Some of them have been explained, and similar ones have been wrought in modern times. But the most of them are still inexplicable by any known laws of nature. As I have already said, if they could all be explained by laws and forces unknown at present, that would not impair their value as miracles.* Christianity is responsible for the facts and events as recorded and nothing more. Either the prophets and apostles knew these laws and forces of nature, or they knew them not. If they knew them, where did they get this knowledge? Such knowledge could not have been derived from their experience, but can alone be explained from divine inspiration. If they did not know these laws of nature, then they wrought the miracles by simple faith in the power of God that was given to them with their commission. In fact, it is just this latter which is characteristic of Biblical miracles. The testing of ordinary human experience of the laws of nature amounts to nothing in such cases. We have to do with questions of fact to be established by credible evidence. This evidence consists in the testimony of credible witnesses, the record of which has been preserved in well-accredited documents. It is sustained by the religious and moral character of the miracles, congruent with the sacred calling of the prophets, and reinforced by sufficient reasons to justify them in giving a divine religion and doctrine to man for his salvation.

Already in the twelfth century St. Thomas Aquinas had given a sufficient answer to the scepticism of Hume and his followers when he said:

"But some one says, It is foolish to believe what is not seen, nor are the things which are not seen to be believed. I reply: (1) that the imperfection of our intellect removes this doubt; for if man could perfectly of himself know all things visible and invisible, it would be foolish to believe what we do not see; but our knowledge is so weak,

* *Authority of Holy Scripture*, pp. 36 *seq.*

that no philosopher has ever been able to investigate perfectly the nature of a single fly. Whence it may be read, that one philosopher lived in solitude thirty years, that he might know the nature of a bee. If therefore our intellect is so weak, is it not foolish to believe nothing of God save only that which man is able to know of himself? And therefore in opposition to this it is said: *Behold God is great, transcending our knowledge* (Job 36^{26}). (2) It may be answered: Suppose that a certain Master (of learning) should say something within his own knowledge; and some rustic should say that what the Master taught was not so, because he himself could not understand it; that rustic would be accounted extremely foolish. But it is certain that the intellect of an angel exceeds the intellect of the ablest philosopher, more than the intellect of the ablest philosopher the intellect of a rustic. And therefore the philosopher is foolish, if he is unwilling to believe those things which angels say, and much more if he is unwilling to believe those things which God says. And in opposition to this it is said: *A great many things beyond human perception are shown unto thee* (Ecclesiasticus 3^{25}). (3) It may be answered, that if a man is unwilling to believe anything save those things which he may know, it is certain that he cannot live in this world. For how can any one live, unless he believe some one? How indeed could he believe that such an one was his own father? And therefore it is necessary that a man should believe some one as to those things which he cannot know perfectly of himself. But none is so worthy to be believed as God; and therefore those who do not believe the words of Faith, are not wise, but foolish and proud, as says the Apostle: *Proud is he, knowing nothing* (I Tim. 6^{4}). Wherefore he said: *I know in Whom I have believed, and I am sure* (II Tim. 1^{12}). *Ye who fear God, believe in Him* (Eccles. 11^{8}). (4) It is also possible to reply, that God proves that those things which Faith teaches, are true. For if a king should send letters sealed with his seal, no one would dare to say that those letters had not appeared by the will of the king. But it is certain that all those things which the saints have believed, and transmitted to us of the Faith of Christ, are signed with the seal of God: which seal those works display, which no mere creature is able to do. And these are miracles, by which Christ has confirmed the sayings of the Apostles and the saints. If thou shouldst say, that no one sees miracles take place; I reply to this: It is most certain that all the world was worshipping idols, and persecuting the Faith of Christ, as even the histories of the pagans relate: but nevertheless all have been converted to Christ, both the wise, and the noble, and the rich, and the powerful, and the great at the preaching of the simple, and the poor, and the few, preaching Christ. Now this has either been wrought miraculously, or it has not. If miraculously, the proposition is proven. If

not, I say that there could not be a greater miracle, than that the whole world should be converted without miracles. So then no one ought to doubt the Faith, but believe those things which are of Faith more than those things which he sees: for the sight of man may be deceived, but the knowledge of God is never at fault."—(*Symbolum Apostolorum Expositio*, art. I, ii.)

§ 2. *Deism was overcome in Great Britain and her colonies by the vital religion and Christian experience of Methodism, which preached Christ and His Gospel, and insisted on regeneration as a necessary prerequisite for Christian faith and knowledge.*

There were many sects in the time of the Westminster Assembly, as in the time of the Reformation, which were regarded as outside Historical Christianity and Protestantism. The only ones of any importance that survived were the Mennonites of Holland, successors of the more moderate Anabaptists of the Continent of Europe, and the Quakers or Friends of Great Britain. These, although possessed of certain evangelical tendencies, put themselves outside of historical Christianity by their rejection of the consensus of Christianity as to doctrine and institution; and therefore their doctrines and institutions, so far as they have any, cannot be regarded as belonging to Christian Symbolics

The Unitarians of the Reformation period perpetuated themselves in the Socinians of Poland. These have never been recognised by any of the great Churches of the Reformation. Unitarianism arose again in England in the second half of the seventeenth century in John Biddle and his associates, but was soon suppressed. It was revived in England in the early eighteenth century out of Presbyterianism and eventually captured the English Presbyterian organisation. Thomas Emlyn, a Presbyterian minister of Dublin, first advocated Semi-Arianism and was expelled by the Presbytery of Dublin in 1719. James Pierce, of Exeter, took essentially the same position at about the same time, and brought on the subscription controversy among the Non-conformists in England in the Union they had established after the revolution in 1690. The majority, chiefly Presbyterians, refused

to require subscription. The minority, chiefly Congregationalists, separated and subscribed to the first of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the fifth and sixth questions of the Westminster Shorter Catechism. The English Presbyterians in this way opened the door wide for liberty in essential doctrines, and gradually the whole body became either Arian, Semi-Arian, or Modalistic in various conceptions.*

The same tendency was manifested in milder form in the Churches of England and Scotland. Professor Simson, of Glasgow, endeavoured to reconcile Christianity with modern thought, yet within the sphere of historical Christianity. But he was misunderstood and regarded as compromised in an anti-trinitarian direction, tried for heresy, and treated with great injustice. The General Assembly also issued a warning to all professors and ministers. The Church of England was more tolerant, partly because Deism was stronger among the clergy and people, and partly because of the difficulty of discipline in a Church dominated by the Crown and Parliament.

In New England, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Unitarianism arose out of Congregationalism and captured a considerable part of it, together with Harvard College and its Divinity School. Unitarianism did not lose its supremacy in Massachusetts until the second quarter of the century, through the rally of the orthodox about Andover Theological Seminary, which they had established, and their separation from the Unitarians both in Associations and Congregations.† Unitarianism is also outside of historical Christianity, because it denies the essential doctrines of Christianity as to the divinity of Christ and the Holy Trinity.

In the early eighteenth century the Methodist revival gave birth to a number of new denominations, which separated from the existing Churches because of their intolerance to new methods in religious life and work.

* *V.* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 194 *seq.*
† *V.* Colton, *Church and State in America*, 1834.

Methodism was a revival of the vital religion and ethical principles of Puritanism. It was an historical recompense from the Pietism of the Continent for the influence of Puritanism upon Continental Christianity.

Spener, the father of German Pietism, was influenced by the Puritan piety, especially of Baxter, and the French of Labadie. He organised the *collegia pietatis* in Frankfort in 1670, and wrote his *Pia desideria* in 1675, his *Geistliches Priestertum* in 1677. He subsequently laboured in Dresden and finally, from 1691, in Berlin, under the patronage of King Frederick I.

In 1693 the Pietists established a theological School at Halle with A. H. Francke at its head. Pietism did not separate from the Church, but has maintained itself as a party in the German Churches until the present day.

Pietism was carried into the Moravian Church by Count Zinzendorf, who received the exiles from Moravia on his estates at Herrnhut from 1722, and reorganised them as the *Unitas Fratrum* with the *ratio disciplinae* of Bishop Comenius, perpetuating the episcopal succession of the mother Moravian Church. German Pietism influenced John Wesley through the Moravians.

Wesley and Whitfield were the fathers of Methodism in England, the one an Arminian, the other a Calvinist.

It was the earnest desire and purpose of Wesley and Whitfield to simply organise holy circles within the Church, after the example of German Pietism. But their followers were compelled by intolerance to organise separate denominations, the Wesleyans more in sympathy with the Church of England, the followers of Whitfield more in harmony with the Non-conformists. About the same time Methodism was represented in Scotland by the Erskines, who, after their suspension by the Church of Scotland, organised the Associate Presbytery in 1733. It was also represented by the Tennents in the American Presbyterian Church. A conflict ensued which brought about a division of American Presbyterianism into the Old and New Sides. Jacob Frelinghuysen

represented the same movement among the Dutch Reformed and Jonathan Edwards among the Congregationalists in America; but the conflict within these bodies did not produce divisions.*

Pietism and Methodism emphasised regeneration and Christian religious experience; but it cannot be said that they departed from the doctrines of the Churches or the historic institutions of Christianity. They certainly laid more stress on vital and spiritual Christianity, and less on doctrinal and institutional Christianity.

§ 3. *The conflict between Rationalism and Supernaturalism led to a criticism and more careful distinction of the sources of knowledge and to attempts to reconstruct Christian Theology in newer philosophical and scientific forms.*

It soon became plain, especially when Deism passed over to the Continent of Europe, that such a religion of nature as the Deists proposed was not really a natural religion, and never had real existence outside the imagination of the Deists: and accordingly Deism gave place to Scepticism and Atheism, especially in France and the Latin countries; whereas in Northern Europe it passed over into Rationalism.

A series of great philosophers arose, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, Kant, Hegel, Schelling, and their associates and successors, who undermined and well-nigh destroyed the ancient philosophical forms in which Christian doctrine had been framed. A large number of great scientific discoveries were made, which rendered it impossible to maintain many traditional opinions that were based on statements of Holy Scripture; and the extension of the knowledge of the laws of nature and of the uniformity of its operations inclined scientific men to resent any interference with these laws, even on the part of the Deity. Theologians were compelled to consider whether the formulas of the Faith could be divested of their ancient philosophical frames and reframed in terms of modern thought, and whether

* *V.* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 238 *seq.*

the supernatural in the Bible and the Church could be reconciled with the laws of nature and of mind. Pantheism, Rationalism, and finally Agnosticism were the chief opponents of Historical Christianity in the nineteenth century.

A series of efforts were made to get rid of the historic Christ and Apostolic Christianity by the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, the legendary hypothesis of Renan, and the development hypotheses of Baur and Ritschl, in various theories of rival religious parties and their result on historic Christianity. All of these have been refuted by the great Christian theologians of the last century. All have been driven from the field except the school of Ritschl, about which the opponents of the supernatural have rallied for a desperate stand against Apostolic Christianity.

It is easy for them with their speculative theories of science and philosophy to make a plausible case against historic Christianity to the academic adherents of these theories; but it is also easy to repel them as revivers of ancient heresies, as contributing nothing whatever to the solution of the mysteries of Christianity, and as unsettling the realms of Science and Philosophy more than the realm of Religion. They have had no influence whatever upon the people of God, whose Christian experience is sufficient to withstand all their theorising.

There have been theologians enough who, with more or less success, have tried to reform Christian doctrine by reconstructing it in the forms of the modern philosophies. But such reconstructions have had a brief existence, passing away with the popularity of the particular philosophy that was used. The Kantians and the Neo-Kantians or Ritschlians reduce Christianity itself to a moral system. The Hegelians make it a modern Gnosis. The school of Schleiermacher has been more successful in building on the religious principle of absolute dependence upon God. Each and all of these have shown themselves defective and unstable, and, when compared with the Theology of the Bible and the Church, narrower and less comprehensive. All that is really

valuable in any of these systems was already contained in the Historic Theology of the Church. There were traditional exaggerations in the Scholastic and Mystic Theologies which Criticism easily destroyed. But the Biblical and historical substance, resting on divine authority, could not be impaired. The Religious Reason of Schleiermacher gives us a religious foundation in metaphysics, but nothing more. The Ethical Reason of Kant gives us the moral fruit of Theology without its religious and intellectual foundation, and is without vital power. The Gnosis of Hegel has no basis in religion and no fruit in morals. Philosophers greater than any of them, Plato and Aristotle, still give to Christianity metaphysical forms for the doctrines of Faith, which modern philosophers have been able to criticise in detail, but have not been able to dislodge as a whole. The ablest modern theologians have been eclectic in their use of modern philosophies, and have found little difficulty in appropriating all that is useful in them and incorporating it with the ancient impregnable Metaphysic and Mystic of the Christian Faith.

§ 4. *The Christian denominations, that arose in the nineteenth century did not differ in any marked degree from those already existing in their Faith, but only in practical matters of Christian Institution, and therefore have added nothing to Christian Symbolics.*

The new denominations of Christians, which originated in the nineteenth century in the midst of the environment described above, had as their chief purpose vital piety and the practical religious life, usually accompanied with resentment against speculative theology and the formalism so often associated with religious institutions. The exaggeration of dogma by the scholastic theologians, in their elaboration of the more technical and difficult doctrines of the Symbols at the expense of the simple and vital ones of the Bible and primitive Christianity, brought about the depreciation of the Symbols of Protestantism, and the exaltation of the Bible and the primitive Creeds above them. Accordingly, most of

the new denominations have revised the various Protestant Symbols in the interest of simplicity, or have adopted new and simple Creeds setting forth only the essential doctrines of Christianity, or have made the Bible itself their only Symbol.

The older Churches of the period of the Reformation, or of the seventeenth century, have for the most part either abandoned their Symbols altogether, or else retained them as historic monuments, without requiring any more than a general adherence to them on the part of the ministry. No Symbol has been adopted by any Protestant Church which adds anything whatever to the historic Faith of the Church. The tendency has rather been to reduce the historic Faith in the direction of Biblical simplicity.

The revivals of the early and middle nineteenth century originated several new denominations.

(1) In America the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was organised in 1810. In the great revival in the Cumberland valley, Kentucky, James McGready made use of pious but uneducated men who were ordained by the Presbytery of Cumberland. This action was condemned by the Synod of Kentucky, which dissolved the Presbytery in 1806. The prosecuted ministers reorganised the Presbytery and carried on their work, and out of this nucleus a great denomination gradually arose.

(2) In 1811 Thomas Campbell organised the first church of the *Christian Association*, with the Bible as the only Creed. His principles, however, were those of the Evangelical Methodists in doctrine and of the Baptists in Institution. His son Alexander carried on his work, and out of it has grown another great denomination known as *Christians* or *Disciples of Christ*.

(3) The Free Church of Scotland was organised in 1843 by the withdrawal of four hundred and seventy-four ministers from the Established Church, under the leadership of Thomas Chalmers, in the supposed interests of vital religion and of the crown rights of Jesus Christ against "Moderation" in

religion and the intrusion of civil authorities in ecclesiastical affairs.

(4) Besides these a considerable number of Christian denominations have arisen, especially in Great Britain and America, but also in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Holland, partly because of the intolerance of the bodies from which they went forth and partly because of their own intolerance in insisting upon their special opinions to such a degree as to make co-operation in Christian work impracticable. These have separated, divided among themselves, reunited again in whole or in part, increasing the number of Christian bodies to an indefinite extent. The peculiarities of these bodies are chiefly in the way of church discipline and methods of religious work. They do not, except in rare instances, depart from the consensus of historic Christianity, but usually regard doctrinal differences in the denominations of Protestants as of minor importance.

The most vital and powerful religious force of the nineteenth century originated in the revival movement at Oxford in 1833–41, which was essentially a reaction toward the authoritative religion of the ancient and mediæval Church: some, with Newman and Manning, seeking refuge in the Roman Catholic Church on the principles of catholicity, especially that of Augustine, *securus judicat orbis terrarum;* * some with Pusey and Keble, remaining faithful to the Church of England with the effort to enrich her faith and institutions by a return to those of the Middle Ages in their pure and uncorrupted forms. In fact, religion, on the whole, at the beginning of the twentieth century, inclines to be a religion of divine authority rather than one of human speculation.

H. K. Carroll, in his valuable work on the *Religious Forces of the United States*, 1912, gives the result of the census of the United States as follows:

"A full half of the 170 bodies report less than 10,000 communicants each, and 70 have less than 5,000 each. To put the matter in another

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, p. 68.

way, the great mass of communicants are found in the first 37 denominations in Table III, embracing all denominations having 100,000 and upward. These 37 bodies contain more than 95 per cent of all communicants, or 33,580,000, leaving only 1,665,000 for all the remaining 133 bodies. From all which it appears that the division of religious bodies is more a matter of name than of fact." *

Several of these may be regarded as Christian: but by their own act they have departed from historical Christianity, either as to Faith, or Institution, or both; and whatever Symbols they have cannot rightly be considered in Christian Symbolics.

The only new denominations of any importance which are outside of historical Christianity are the Latter-Day Saints (Mormon), the Plymouth Brethren, Spiritualistic Societies, and the Christian Scientists. Several of the old heretic sects persist with reduced numbers. If these are thrown out there remain only thirty-two denominations having over one hundred thousand communicants each. These may easily be reduced to nine types.

	COMMUNICANTS
Roman Catholic	12,425,947
Methodists (16 bodies)	6,615,052
Baptists (15 bodies)	5,603,137
Presbyterian and Reformed (16 bodies)	2,368,955
Lutheran (23 bodies)	2,243,486
Disciples of Christ (2 bodies)	1,464,774
Episcopalian (2 bodies)	938,390
Congregationalist	735,400
Eastern Orthodox (7 bodies)	385,000

These types have all been considered in their relation to Christian Symbolics.

There are other minor variations from these, but none of them require any special consideration from the point of view of Christian Symbolics; for what Symbols they have are only modifications of older Symbols in the direction of simplicity and not of the addition of new doctrines.

* *Religious Forces of the United States*, p. LXXV.

PART III

COMPARATIVE SYMBOLICS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Comparative Symbolics has to compare the doctrinal statements of the Symbols of the separated Churches and determine their consensus and their dissensus, together with their underlying principles.

It presupposes the preliminary work of Particular Symbolics, and can only give a summary of the results of that section of our discipline.

Comparative Symbolics has nothing to do prior to the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, which resulted in the division of the Church into so many different denominations and national Churches. In the ancient Church there were controversies, decided by ecumenical Councils, which resulted in schisms; but these controversies were with reference to certain particular doctrines. These have been considered in connection with the ecumenical determination of those doctrines. In the mediæval Church there were also heresies and schisms, but these were only of minor importance. We have studied them sufficiently in connection with the decisions rejecting them. It is true that during all that period the Eastern Church was separated from the Western; but there was no doctrinal difference of any importance except as to the *filioque*, and that was defined at the Council of Florence so as to reconcile the difference.* The conflict

* *V.* pp. 135 *seq.*

between these two great divisions of Christendom is institutional rather than doctrinal.

The situation became entirely different at the Reformation; for while institutional questions were even then the most serious, yet they involved doctrinal questions of grave importance, which were discussed and decided by the Roman, Greek, Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican Churches in separate Symbols. These Symbols were for the most part theological treatises rather than decisions of new questions of doctrine. We have considered in the previous part, Particular Symbolics, the origin of the Reformation and its progress, resulting in the organisation of separate Churches and the adoption of particular symbols. We must now, on that historical basis, compare these symbols and study: (1) the principles of the Reformation common to them; (2) the consensus and dissensus as to the Sacraments, and (3) the consensus and dissensus as to Faith and Morals.

The symbolical formation did not cease with the Reformation itself. In the three great branches of Protestantism internal controversies arose, which resulted in a second stage of symbolical formation, where again we have to distinguish between consensus and dissensus. The conflict began in the latter part of the sixteenth century and continued till the middle of the seventeenth century. In this conflict we shall have to consider: (1) the consensus and dissensus in connection with the Formula of Concord, of the Lutherans; (2) the Synod of Dort of the Reformed and the conflicts involved in its decisions; (3) the Westminster Symbols and the divisions of British Christianity.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the internal controversies of Protestantism continued, yet resulted in no additional symbolic definitions of doctrine, but only in the revision and condensation of previous symbolic statements. Therefore our final chapter has only to consider the consensus of modern Protestantism in connection with modern irenic movements.

The Roman Catholic Church alone has made a symbolical

advance in this last period of Christianity, culminating in the Vatican Council of 1870. These Symbols we have sufficiently considered in the previous part under Particular Symbolics* and in their relation to the party in that Church which could not accept them, but separated as Old Catholics. The Old Catholics, Greeks, and Protestants did not, however, make any symbolical definitions over against the Roman Catholic Symbols, and therefore there is no call for Comparative Symbolics in the study of them.

The Faith of the Reformation was built upon the Faith of the ancient and mediæval Church in its consensus. The dissensus sprang out of controversies which arose during the Middle Ages, but had not reached their solution; and also out of new questions, which originated out of the circumstances of the dawn of the modern age of the world.

Western Christianity had its symbolical inheritance from the ancient and the mediæval Church. This symbolical inheritance was accepted without question by the reformers, Protestant as well as Catholic, at the beginning; and there was a general desire that the questions of serious importance, thrust upon the Church by the circumstances of the times, might be determined by an ecumenical Council as all previous questions had been. It was not until these questions loomed up with excessive importance before the reformers that the new doctrines carried with them modification, and in some cases even serious departure, from the symbolic decisions of the Middle Ages. But there was not even the slightest modification of the Trinitarian and Christological decisions of the primitive Church, except among sects which were repudiated by all branches of Protestants as well as by Greece and Rome.

It is common to interpret the Reformation from a Protestant point of view, to identify it with Protestantism, and to regard the reforming of the Roman Catholic Church as a counter-Reformation. This is an unphilosophical and unhistorical way of considering this great event in history.

* *V.* pp. 221 *seq.*

We shall endeavour to avoid that mistake in this volume. The fundamental principles of the Reformation were common to the Protestant Reform and the Roman Catholic Reform. The consensus of the Symbols of the Reformation, even as regards the new doctrines, is much greater than the dissensus; and it is just in this consensus that the real symbolic advance of the Christian Church has been made. The same essential situation will appear in our study of the second symbolical formation in Protestantism.

CHAPTER II

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION

§ 1. *The great religious principle of the Reformation was the assertion of the necessity of divine authority in matters of religion. The differences among the reformers were as to the media through which this divine authority comes to man. The Roman Catholic reformers made the Church the chief medium, the Protestants the Bible. Only a few radicals thought of the Reason as the final authority.*

The question as to *the principles of the Reformation* is of great importance. It has been much discussed by many of the greatest theologians of the past; but, so far as I have been able to determine, it has always been limited to *the principles of Protestantism.* About these, there is still no agreement. Most think of two principles, some of three, some of but one.

(1) It is quite common in our day to regard *the universal priesthood of believers* as the fundamental principle of the Reformation. It is undoubtedly true that the Reformation revived that ancient Biblical conception, which had been pushed into the background for many centuries; but this was not the essential principle, as is evident from several reasons.

(*a*) The principle of the universal priesthood of believers, if the stress is laid on the individual believer as an *individual,* combining all the functions of priesthood in himself, is unbiblical and unhistorical. Neither the Roman Catholics nor the Protestants stand for that. Only a few Anabaptists would agree with nineteenth-century individualism in that regard.

It is quite true that there is a sense in which all Christians

are priests, as indeed all Israelites were under the Old Covenant, in so far as they have immediate access to God—the people of the Old Covenant as united by circumcision to the kingdom of God, admitted to the altar of burnt-offering and to the exercise of private personal religion; the Christian, as baptised in the name of Christ and the Holy Trinity, and admitted to the Lord's table, with the privilege of family and private worship. Both are priests in the same sense, and in no other. The Church has never denied that baptised Christians are priests in this fundamental sense, whether Catholic, or Greek, or Protestant. But it is not true that all Christians are equally priests, so as to dispense with a ministering official priesthood. That is the only question in dispute, and to that there can be but one answer: that Jesus Christ and His Apostles instituted an official ministry, to use as His representatives the functions of prophecy, priesthood, and royalty, for the people to whom they minister.

Luther, in his address to the *Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, used unguarded language on this subject in his red-hot battle with the Roman hierarchy, which he subsequently qualified by his own teaching and acting against the Anabaptists and against all the reformers who did not agree with him; but even Luther, in this address, was careful enough, when he said that "all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate; there is no difference among them," to add the qualification, "save of office alone."

Luther's qualifications are often neglected, both those of the address and those of his subsequent life, by men who wish to deny the priestly office of the ministry altogether. Baptism undoubtedly is a consecration more important and fundamental than the bishop's consecration, as Luther urges; but it does not dispense with consecration to the ministerial office in the Lutheran or in any other Christian Church.

(*b*) If, however, the principle is understood in its Biblical and historical sense as implying the royal priesthood of the Christian Church as an organism, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants alike are agreed as to that. The difference

is as to the degree of emphasis put upon it. In fact, neither body has emphasised it sufficiently.

(*c*) The battle of the Reformation was not a battle against the priesthood of the ministry in the interest of the priesthood of the laity; it was rather a battle against the royal function of the ministry in the interest of the laity, and it resulted, all over the Protestant world, in the exaltation of the State above the Church in government, in royal, and not in priestly functions.

(*d*) So far as the Christian ministry is concerned, the Protestant Reformation really resulted in the exaltation of the prophetic function of the ministry from the depreciation into which it had fallen in the late Middle Ages. The royal function of the ministry went to the State in its culmination, in Lutheran Germany, in the consistorial system, in the Church of England in the royal supremacy, and in the Reformed Churches in a kind of theocracy, whether we look to Geneva or New England. The priestly function of the ministry was not denied in Protestantism, but only depreciated when the prophetic was exalted above it. Rome, on the other hand, exalted the priestly function and depreciated the prophetic, at least so far as the general ministry was concerned.

(2) Neander reduces the difference between Rome and Protestantism to the simple principle,* *Communion with Christ*, either *immediate* as in Protestantism, or *mediate* as in Roman Catholicism. In this he follows Schleiermacher, who says that Protestantism "makes the relation of the individual to the Church dependent on his relation to Christ; Catholicism, *vice versa*, makes the relation of the individual to Christ dependent on his relation to the Church." (*Der Christliche Glaube*, I, § 24.)

But Roman Catholics indignantly deny that they discourage immediate communion with God. Most religious orders lay stress upon it. The contemplative piety of the orders is sufficient evidence of it. And it is characteristic

* *Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, 1863, ss. 30 *seq.*

of Mysticism in its mediæval, as well as its modern forms, that it urged such communion in every way. Such an antithesis as Schleiermacher and Neander proposed, cannot be made out except in a relative emphasis upon one or the other of the two. So Protestants do not altogether deny mediate communion with God. They assert that the Church and Sacraments are means of grace, no less than Roman Catholics.

Undoubtedly the Church before the Reformation had a religion, consisting to an undue extent in external rites and ceremonies; and it may well be described as *externalism, formalism, ritualism, ceremonialism,* and *ecclesiastical works.* Piety had taken refuge to a great extent in pious families and certain devout associations. Undoubtedly the mass of Christendom had union and communion with God through the mediation of the ministry; and immediate communion with God was confined chiefly to mystics and pious individuals under their influence. But the Roman Catholic Reformation, as well as the Protestant Reformation, changed all this. And personal piety was extended by the Roman Catholic Reformation no less truly than by the Protestant.

An external religion is not characterised by a multitude of forms rather than a few, but by an exaggeration of such forms as it has. A spiritual religion is not characterised by a paucity of forms, but by an emphasis on the spirit in the use of such forms as it has. The difference between Protestantism and the Roman Church is more carefully stated by Twesten:*

"Catholicism emphasizes the first, Protestantism the second, clause of the passage of Irenæus: 'Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.'"

The real difference here is a matter of emphasis, nothing more.

(3) The usual statement as to the principles of the Protestant Reformation is that there are two: (*a*) the material

* *V.* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom,* I, p. 208, n.

principle, *Justification by Faith;* (*b*) the formal principle, *the Infallible Authority of the Scriptures.*

The Lutherans lay more stress on the former; the Reformed lay more stress on the latter. Indeed, it is necessary to add *only* to both clauses to get a strong antithesis to Rome even here. For justification by faith and the divine authority of the Scriptures were never denied by the Roman Catholics. They contended that the divine authority was in apostolic tradition as well as in the Scriptures; and that justification was by love and good works, the fruits of faith, and not by faith *only.* Undoubtedly the greatest antithesis is found at these two points; but they do not cover the whole ground, and it is historically impossible to make the division between Protestantism and Rome depend on the word *only.*

(4) Several scholars add to these two principles a third; but they differ in defining it.

Kahnis* finds a third *Kirchenprincip* in the idea of *the Invisible Church.* There can be no doubt that this became a characteristic feature of Protestantism; but not so much more so than other features as to make it a fundamental principle. It is really a development out of the high Augustinianism of Luther and Calvin, and derived from Augustine himself, and is not denied by Rome except in its Protestant exaggeration.

(5) Schaff recognises a *social principle* in the supremacy of the Christian people over an exclusive priesthood.

"There are three fundamental principles of the Reformation: the supremacy of the *Scriptures* over tradition, the supremacy of *faith* over works, and the supremacy of the Christian *people* over an exclusive priesthood."

Schaff then goes further and resolves his three principles into one: "*evangelical freedom,* or *freedom in Christ.*"† This is the principle of the universal priesthood of believers in a

* *Über die Principien d. Protestantismus,* 1865, ss. 52 *seq.*

† *History of the Christian Church,* vol. VI, *The German Reformation,* p. 16.

modernised form; but in this form it is open to even greater objections, because neither in the Lutheran nor in the Anglican Reformation had the Christian people any supremacy whatever. Supremacy was in the civil government. This principle would have to be stated rather in the form of the supremacy of the crown over the Church. But in that form, in which alone it is true, who could accept it as a principle of the Reformation? There was no such freedom for individuals in any Church of the Reformation, but only a freedom for governments from the dominion of Rome. The Protestant governments gave the individual "evangelical freedom" if he accepted the Gospel as authoritatively determined by them, but not otherwise. The Calvinist had no freedom in Lutheran lands, the Presbyterian no freedom in England, the Anabaptists no freedom anywhere. To call such freedom *evangelical freedom*, or *freedom in Christ*, is to put modern American ideas of freedom in religion into the Protestantism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries where they had no place.

Schaff, however, brings to the front an important difference between the Lutheran and the Swiss.

"As regards justification by faith, Luther made it the article of the standing or falling Church; while Zwingli and Calvin subordinated it to the ulterior truth of eternal forcordination by free grace." *

Upon this I have remarked: "Redemption by the divine grace alone is the banner principle of the Reformed Churches, designed to exclude the uncertainty and arbitrariness attached to all human instrumentalities and external agencies. As the banner principle of the Lutheran Reformation was justification by faith alone, excluding any merit or agency of human works, so the Calvinistic principle excluded any inherent efficacy, in human nature or in external remedies, for overcoming the guilt of sin and working redemption. In these two principles lie the chief merits and the chief defects of the two great Churches of the Reformation. Intermediate between these principles, of faith alone, and grace alone, lies a third principle, which is the divine Word alone. This principle has been emphasized in the Reformation of Great Britain and especially in the Puritan Churches. The Word of God has been called the formal principle of Protestantism over against

* *History of Christian Church*, VII, *Swiss Reformation*, p. 10.

faith alone, the material principle; and it has been said that the Reformed Churches have laid more stress upon the formal principle, while the Lutheran Churches have laid more stress upon the material principle. This does not, in our judgment, correspond with the facts of the case. Rather is it true that in the three great Churches of the Reformation the three principles, faith, grace and the divine Word were emphasized; but these Churches differed in the relative importance they ascribed to one of these three principles of the Reformation in its relation to the other two. The Word of God is the intermediate principle where faith and grace meet. The Word of God gives faith its appropriate object. The Word of God is the appointed instrument, or means of grace."—(*General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 651–2.)

We may conclude, therefore, that the fundamental religious principle of Protestantism, in which all unite, is that *the Bible is the chief medium of divine authority and grace.* They could not go further because they were obliged to claim divine authority for the Church in the ordination of the ministry, the administration of the sacraments, the worship and organisation of the Church. But this authority was derived from God through the Scriptures, which were regarded as alone infallible.

(6) The Reformation was, however, wider than Protestantism. Roman Catholics considered the same great problems; and, while they came to somewhat different conclusions, yet they did advance reform in religion and doctrine in their own way.

There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholics advanced the Church as the chief fountain of divine authority and grace without at all denying that the Scriptures had also these functions fundamentally and originally. They did not claim that the Church had any authority to contradict or displace any Scripture; but only to explain, unfold, and adapt the authority of Scripture as circumstances required.

(7) Protestants and Catholics agree in exalting divine authority, and requiring a *jus divinum* for everything in religion, to such an extent as had never been the case before

in Christian history. This insistence upon the divine authority of itself destroyed a multitude of evils and introduced a multitude of reforms. The simple question: *What is the will of God?* whether asked by Protestant or Catholic, was a great destroyer of intellectual and moral cobwebs. And in practice the antithesis could never be so sharp as the mere words imply. The Catholic could never put the Bible over against the Church. He was obliged to say Bible and Church. Only the Protestant could make the antithesis; and the Protestant could do so only by distinguishing between the true Church and the false, or the visible and the invisible Church. In practice the Protestant Churches could not antagonise the Bible with the Church without thereby destroying their own Churches. They were compelled to recognise the authority of the Church in interpreting the Bible as truly as the Roman Catholic. They recognised fallibility; but that was theoretical rather than practical, for, even if fallible, Protestant ecclesiastical authorities were just as ready to burn, drown, hang, and banish heretics as were the Roman Catholic authorities of an infallible Church. Practically it made no difference whatever to the common man, who at the close of the sixteenth century changed his religion as he did his cloak, as the ecclesiastical weather changed. And that was also the case with the majority of the pastors of village congregations, who were more interested in the welfare of their flocks and themselves than in doctrinal and institutional differences. This may be regarded as indifference to the importance of these great questions. But underlying all these differences is the fundamental question whether they are, indeed, more important than the peace and welfare of the people, and the interests of practical religion.

§ 2. *The Protestants and Romanists agreed in maintaining the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures.*

Luther, at the Diet of Worms, made this his fundamental position.

"Nisi convictus fuero testimoniis Scripturarum, aut ratione evidente (nam neque Papae, neque Conciliis solis credo, cum constet eos errasse sæpius et sibi ipsis contradixisse), victus sum Scripturis a me adductis, captaque est conscientia in verbis Dei: revocare neque possum neque volo quidquam, cum contra conscientiam agere neque tutum sit, neque integrum. *Hie stehe ich. Ich kan nicht anders. Gott helff mir. Amen.*" *

The Augsburg Confession does not give a chapter, or even a section, to the Scripture; but it is pervaded throughout with an appeal to the Gospel as the supreme test of truth and right. The Formula of Concord (1576) first defines the Lutheran faith in the Scriptures.

The Reformed Confessions begin with the doctrine of the supreme authority of the Scriptures: so the Sixty-seven Articles of Zwingli, the Ten Theses of Bern, the First Helvetic, the Second Helvetic, and so on, the great majority of them. They are concerned to appeal to the Scriptures against the Roman Church.

But the Roman Church no less asserts the supreme authority of Holy Scripture:

"Following the example of the orthodox Fathers, (the Synod) receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the Author of both."—(Council of Trent, Sess. 4.)

There is no difference whatever between the Churches at this point.

§ 3. *The Roman Catholics adhered to the traditional Augustinian Canon, the Protestants to the traditional Hieronymian Canon. The Protestants distinguished between the Canonical and the Apocryphal Books, and used the latter for instruction, but not as divinely authoritative; the Roman Catholics made no distinction between them.*

The Augsburg Confession does not define the Canon of Scripture. The traditional Lutheran position does not differ from the Reformed except in using the Apocryphal

* Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*, 1911, p. 85.

Books with greater respect and veneration. The Reformed Churches define the Canon as excluding the Apocrypha. The Anglican Church does the same.*

The original position of all the reformers was, to use the language of the Anglican Articles, that the Apocrypha should be read "for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply to them to establish any doctrine." It was not until later times that the Puritans altogether ruled out the Apocrypha as of no more authority than other human writing.†

Thus for the first time by this fixing of the Canon of Scripture the Church restricted liberty of opinion on this subject. The Roman Catholics were now bound to accept the Apocryphal Books as divine; the Protestants were bound to reject them from the Canon. The question naturally arose: What authority is there to define the Canon? The Roman Catholics said: God in the Church. The Protestants said: God Himself, speaking in the Scriptures themselves. But who is to determine the voice of God in the Scriptures? Shall every Christian make his own Canon? Or shall the Church determine that question? The Protestant Churches reached practically the same position as the Roman Catholic; for they defined and limited the Canon as it had never been limited before, and made their authoritative decisions binding upon all, ministers and people. The only real difference was that the Roman Catholics claimed the right of the Church to decide and define, and they did it: the Protestants denied the right of the Church to define, and yet they did it. Both alike destroyed the liberty of opinion that had been in the Church before.‡

§ 4. *Tradition was recognised by Roman Catholics as of primitive divine authority when expressed in the unanimous*

* II *Helvetic*, 1^9; *Belgic Conf.* 6; *Articles of Religion*, 6.

† *Cf. Westminster Confession*, 1^3.

‡ *V.* Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 141 *seq.*, 164 *seq.*

consent of the Fathers and apostolic in character, but was ruled out from the realm of divine authority by all Protestants, who would only recognise it as authoritative so far as it agreed with Holy Scripture.

The *Augsburg Confession*, in Article I, asserts faith in the *Nicene Creed* just as truly as the *Council of Trent* in its first *Decree*. So do the *Articles of Religion* (VIII), the *French Confession* (V), and other Symbols of the Reformation.

The antagonism to tradition was not to ancient tradition but to more recent tradition against the Word of God. The Protestants observed traditions which were not harmful.* The French Confession is more hostile to tradition.† The *Anglican Articles* assert the sufficiency of Scripture. And yet reverence for the first three centuries, and even for the first six centuries, has persisted in the Church of England to the present time.‡ In fact, much was retained of tradition, at the Reformation, not in Scripture. Is the value of tradition to be limited to what Scripture verifies? or has tradition an independent value, so far as it does not conflict with Scripture?

The Roman Catholic position recognises oral apostolic tradition as co-ordinate in authority with written Scripture.§ Roman Catholics do not recognise any conflict between Tradition and Scripture. Any seeming conflict is explained in precisely the same way as seeming conflict between different passages of Scripture. The usual Protestant antithesis, Bible against Tradition, or Tradition making void the Bible, the Roman Catholics do not recognise as valid.

Both sides are agreed that any traditions that are contrary to the Bible should be rejected. The question as to any particular tradition is either a question of fact or one of interpretation. Protestants and Roman Catholics disagree in that Roman Catholics attribute an independent authority to tra-

* *V. Augsb. Conf.* I, 22; II, 5; I *Helvetic*, 3, 4.
† *Gallican*, 5; *cf. Belgic*, 7.
‡ Article VI; *cf. Formula of Concord, Epitome* 1.
§ *Conc. Trent.* Sess. 4.

dition supplementary to Scripture and in matters where Scripture does not speak. Protestants regard this testimony as simply historical, which they may accept or reject, as seems best in any particular case, from other reasons than that of any authority in the tradition itself. Protestantism is not altogether consistent in this regard.

(1) The Bible does not, in fact, give us all that the Protestants thought that they found in it. Accordingly, when the Puritans in England insisted upon chapter and verse of the Bible for every doctrine and institution of the Church, they challenged many institutions of the Church of England, and insisted upon a revision of the Book of Common Prayer and Articles of Religion into a closer conformity with Scripture; that is, in fact, into a closer conformity with the Reformed Churches of the Continent. The English Parliament brought the Westminster Assembly into confusion, when they demanded a *jus divinum* for their recommendations, especially that of the right to exclude from the Eucharist.* Later the Congregationalists challenged the Episcopal and Presbyterian forms of government as not based on Scripture. The Baptists challenged infant baptism. The Fifth Monarchy men tried to realise the kingdom of God on earth. And thus the numerous non-conforming churches and parties of Great Britain arose by pressing the Scripture principle as the only valid authority. But even these bodies still maintained many things that have no authority in the Scriptures by any valid interpretation of them. The appeal to Scripture alone, if thoroughly carried out, destroys all existing Churches according to the interpretation of scholars in other Churches.

(2) All Protestants use apostolic traditions for institutions which cannot be explained from the Bible. Modern scholarship has made it impossible to build on Scripture alone, and it is only a question of degree how far any existing church organisation uses the principle of tradition.

(3) All Protestants accept the ancient Creeds, and also

* *V.* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 66 *seq.*

the doctrines of sin and grace of Augustine, and of the atonement of Anselm. Here again liberty of opinion was restricted by both parties, as we shall see later on. The Protestant bodies supposed, and rightly so, that these doctrines were based upon and confirmed by Holy Scripture. At the same time, these doctrines were accepted and defined in the terms and interpretations of the Creeds and the Fathers, thereby adding tradition to Scripture.

§ 5. *The Roman Catholics declared that the Church was the authoritative interpreter of Scripture. The Protestants declared that Scripture was its own interpreter to the right-minded.*

The Council of Trent takes this position:

"Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees, that no one, relying on his own skill, shall,—in matters of Faith and of Morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church,—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." (Sess. 4.)

The insistence of Luther that his conscience could only be bound by Scripture itself and not by the decision of Councils, invokes the principle that Scripture interprets itself to the pious man. This is distinctly taught in the First Helvetic Confession. "This holy, divine Scripture is not to be interpreted and explained in any other way than from itself, by the rule of faith and love." (Art. 2.)

The Protestant position was not, in fact, maintained; because no national Church permitted the individual to interpret the Scripture for himself. All Churches gave official interpretations of Scripture in their Confessions of Faith, which all men in the nation were required to maintain. And so the Protestant ecclesiastical bodies gave official interpretations of Scripture no less than the Roman Catholic. Luther, Calvin, Beza, Cranmer were as insistent that their interpre-

tations of Scripture were the only correct ones as were the Roman Catholic bishops and the Pope.

The Protestant principle that the Scripture was its own interpreter, and that doubtful passages were to be interpreted in accordance with those that were not doubtful, is most excellent. But who shall decide as to these passages? In fact, both Protestants and Roman Catholics are right; and their principles are complementary and not exclusive. We must recognise that, while Scripture ordinarily interprets itself to the right-minded, yet this is not always the case; and that the final decision must rest with the Church and not with the individual, provided the Church does not decide against truth and righteousness.

§ 6. *Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed in holding to the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that that Church was possessed of divine authority for the work of the ministry and the administration of the sacraments. They differed as to the organisation of the Church and the functions of the ministry.*

Luther in his *Appeal to the Christian Nobility* says:

"I let alone Pope, bishops, foundations, priests, and monks, whom God hath not instituted. . . . I will speak of the office of pastor, which God hath instituted to rule a community with preaching and sacraments."

The *Augsburg Confession* says:

"But the Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered." (7, *cf.* 8.)

"No man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called." (14.)

"The power of the keys, or the power of the Bishops, by the rule of the Gospel, is a power or commandment from God, of preaching the Gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the sacraments."

. . . . . .

"Again, by the Gospel, or, as they term it, by divine right, Bishops, as Bishops . . . have no other jurisdiction at all, but only to remit

sin, also to judge in regard to doctrine, and to reject doctrine inconsistent with the Gospel, and to exclude from the communion of the Church, without human force, but by the Word [of God], those whose wickedness is known. And herein of necessity the churches ought by divine right to render obedience unto them; according to the saying of Christ, 'He that heareth you, heareth me' (Luke 10^{16}). But when they teach or determine any thing contrary to the Gospel, then have the churches a commandment of God, which forbiddeth obedience to them: 'Beware of false prophets' (Mt. 7^{15})."

. . . . . .

"Besides these things, there is a controversy whether Bishops or Pastors have power to institute ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, and holidays, and degrees, or orders of ministers, etc. They that ascribe this power to the Bishops allege this testimony for it: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; but when that Spirit of truth shall come, He shall teach you all truth' (John $16^{12, 13}$). They allege also the examples of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood, and that which was strangled (Acts 15^{29}). They allege the change of the Sabbath into the Lord's Day, contrary, as it seemeth, to the Decalogue; and they have no example more in their mouths than the change of the Sabbath. They will needs have the Church's power to be very great, because it hath dispensed with a precept of the Decalogue.

"But of this question ours do thus teach: that the Bishops have no power to ordain anything contrary to the Gospel. . . . The same also do the Canons teach."

. . . . . .

"Whence, then, have the Bishops power and authority of imposing these traditions upon the churches, for the ensnaring of men's consciences, when Peter forbids (Acts 15^{10}) 'to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples,' and St. Paul says (II Cor. 13^{10}) that the power given him was to edification, not to destruction? Why, therefore, do they increase sins by these traditions?" (Part II, Art. 7.)

The real question here was not as to the authority of the bishops to institute ceremonies and impose traditions upon the Church, or as to whether they could ordain anything contrary to the Gospels.

The question was one of *detail*, whether certain ceremonies and traditions were contrary to the Gospel or not, and where the authority was lodged for determining this question. The real situation was that the bishops had not sufficiently studied

the Gospels to be able to judge, and the Protestants had studied the Gospels and found them condemning the bishops. How was the decision to be made? By the Pope, or General Council of the Roman Catholic Church, or by national reforming Churches, or by the individual himself?

The Doctrine of *the Church* of the Reformed Churches is higher than that of the Lutherans, especially in their teaching under the influence of Calvin,* who distinguishes between the visible and the invisible Church, and between the true Church and the false.

"As to the true Church we believe that it should be governed according to the order established by our Lord Jesus Christ."—(*Gallican*, 29.)

"We believe and profess one Catholic or universal Church, which is a holy congregation and assembly of true Christian believers." . . . "This Church hath been from the beginning of the world and will be to the end thereof; which is evident from this, that Christ is an eternal King."—(*Belgic*, 27.)

"We believe that this true Church must be governed by the spiritual policy which our Lord hath taught us in His Word—namely, that there must be ministers or pastors to preach the Word of God, and to administer the sacraments; also elders and deacons who, together with the pastors, form the council of the Church." (30.)

It was just because of the high ideal of the Calvinistic conception of the Church that the conflict subsequently arose in Great Britain over the divine right of Church government and what kind of government Christ instituted for His Church; whereas the Lutherans left the government of the Church for the most part to the civil government.

The Anglicans preserve the threefold ministry. The Reformed assert the parity of the ministry. The Lutherans vary in their church organisation in different countries, using superintendents or bishops, but these not as a separate order.†

The *Council of Trent* treats of the ministry under the *sacrament of order*.‡

* I *Helvetic*, 15–20; II *Helvetic*, 17–18; *Gallican*, 25–32; *Belgic*, 27–32.

† This matter will be considered in connection with the conflicts of British Christianity and the Westminster Confession.

‡ Sess. 23.

Two things are mentioned in the Decrees of Trent as belonging to priesthood: (1) the power of consecrating, offering, and administering the body and blood of our Lord; (2) the forgiving and retaining of sins.

Put this over against the Protestant function—the teaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments—and it is evident that the prophetic office is emphasised by Protestants, the priestly by Roman Catholics. The antithesis appears in the *Council of Trent*, as follows:

"If any one saith, that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or, that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or, that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema." (Sess. 23, Canon 1.)

"If any one saith, that, in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers: let him be anathema." (Canon 6.)

Order is a sacrament to Roman Catholics, but not to Protestants, who regard it as a sacred institution of Christ, essential to the existence of the Church, yet not as having the characteristics of a sacrament. This we shall consider more fully under the head of the sacraments.

§ 7. *Roman Catholics and Protestants alike recognised the office of the Reason. The one claimed that it should bow to the authority of the Church, the other to the Bible. Only some of the Anabaptists and Socinians gave the inner light of the Reason an authority independent of Church and Bible.*

Luther's conscience was bound in the authority of the Bible. As he said at Worms:

"Unless I am refuted and convicted by testimonies of the Scriptures, or by clear arguments (since I believe neither the Pope nor the councils alone; it being evident that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am conquered by the Holy Scriptures quoted by me, and *my conscience is bound in the Word of God:*—I cannot and will not recant

any thing, since it is unsafe and dangerous to do any thing against the conscience."

Luther recognises "clear arguments," when evidently based on the Holy Scriptures, interpreting and explaining them. He also recognises the authority of conscience; not, however, as independent of Scripture, testing Scripture, as if the Bible were like the Church, fallible, but as convinced and conquered by Scripture. Luther's real attitude to the Reason comes out in his conflict with Zwingli and the Anabaptists. At the Marburg Conference he "protested at the outset against arguments derived from reason and geometry." "I believe," said Luther, "that Christ is in heaven, but also in the sacrament, as substantially as He was in the Virgin's womb. I care not whether it be *against nature and reason*, provided it be not against Faith." *

So the Roman Catholics, while recognising the Reason and the Conscience, did not admit their right to determine whether the teaching of the Church was in error or not. Even the Anabaptists, who urged the Inner Light, and the Socinians, who emphasised the Reason in religion, did not formulate their doctrine of the Reason into an independent principle of knowledge. It was reserved for the eighteenth century in the conflict of Christianity against Deism, Rationalism, Pantheism, and Atheism, to determine the authority of the Reason in matters of religion.

In fact, it was necessary to bring the Reason into its independent authority in order to avoid the antithesis between the Bible and the Church, which the Reformation developed. The subordination of the Reason to the Bible or the Church was a mistake of both sides of the Reformation.

The reconciliation is in the recognition of the three independent fountains of divine authority—the Bible, the Church, and the Reason. Each one of these may give final authority and certainty. But they each and all need interpretation; and it is just this interpretation that is fallible.

Where there is difficulty of interpretation, appeal to the

* *V.* Schaff, *German Reformation*, pp. 640 *seq.*

witness of the other two, and in their coincidence secure the final decision.*

It follows from this that private interpretations of Scripture should be submitted to the consensus of interpretation of the Church, and that private opinion should be carefully distinguished from the verdicts of Reason. The concord of Bible, Church, and Reason should be sought in the determination of Faith and Morals.†

It is evident that those moderns who reject both the authority of the Church and the authority of the Bible in matters of Religion have ceased to be Protestants, for they have given up the fundamental Protestant principle. He who builds his religion on the Reason, as it works itself out in his experience in the use of his reasoning powers, his religious feelings and the will, may be a Christian, if he still adheres to those things that are essential to Christianity; but he certainly is outside Protestantism and Christianity itself in his theoretical position, though he may really belong to both by using their institutions and the grace of God that comes to him in their use, despite his errors of opinion and mistaken practices.

* *V.* Briggs, *Authority of Holy Scripture*, pp. 26 *seq.*; *Bible, Church, and Reason*, pp. 30 *seq.*; *Defence*, pp. 31 *seq.* The Vatican Council gives an excellent statement of the concord of Faith and Reason, which we have considered in our study of that Council.

† *V.* the chapter on *Infallibility* in my volume on *Church Unity*.

CHAPTER III

THE SACRAMENTS

Our study of the origin and progress of the Reformation in *Particular Symbolics* made it evident that the primary and fundamental differences between the reformers, Roman Catholic and Protestant, were with reference to Christian Institutions, especially the Sacraments. The differences as to Faith and Morals were really secondary, and arose out of the institutional differences. Undoubtedly, Faith and Morals are more important than Institutions; but they cannot be understood in their historic origin and in the comparative study of the differences unless we discuss first the Sacraments out of which they arose. Therefore, we must depart from the usual *a priori* order, and use the historic and more natural order.

§ 1. *The Roman Catholics asserted the mediæval seven sacraments; the Protestants usually only two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, although Confirmation and Penance were by some regarded as sacramental in character. Orders, matrimony, and unction were not recognised as sacraments by any of the Protestants.*

The *Augsburg Confession* implicitly denies the seven in limiting itself to the two. Luther, in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church,* recognised three sacraments: *baptism, penance,* and *the Lord's Supper,* and argues against the sacramental character of the other four.

"Principio neganda mihi sunt *septem Sacramenta,* et tantum *tria* pro tempore ponenda, baptismus, pœnitentia, panis; et hæc omnia esse

per Romanam Curiam nobis in miserabilem captivitatem ducta, Ecclesiamque sua tota libertate spoliatam."

Most Protestants recognise only two sacraments.*

§ 2. *It was agreed that the Sacraments have form and matter and require a receptive faith; the form being the word of institution, which alone is efficacious; the matter being the external things used, or the external act performed. The difference is that the Roman Catholics assert that the sacraments are efficacious "ex opere operato"; the Protestants that they are signs and seals of the working of the divine Spirit.*†

All agree in Augustine's doctrine: "*A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace. . . . The word is joined to the element, and it becomes a sacrament.*" ‡ They disagree as to the relation of the divine grace to the *Word of Institution.* The Roman Catholics hold that when the word of institution has been spoken, the authority and power of the divine grace are gone forth into the Sacrament and through it to the recipient; and he will certainly receive and enjoy the sacrament, unless there are in him insuperable obstacles to its reception. This does not mean that the word of institution is efficacious of itself and apart from the divine Spirit; but, as the *Roman Catechism* says:

"We know by the light of faith, that in the sacraments exists *the virtue of almighty God,* by which they effect what the natural elements cannot of themselves accomplish." (Quest. 21.)

The Roman Catholics recognise that there may be insuperable obstacles in man himself to his receiving sacramental grace. Thus the *Roman Catechism:*

"Yet if we regard sanctifying and saving grace, we are all well aware that by him who purposes to live according to the flesh, and not

* *Cf.* I *Helvetic,* 21; *Gallican,* 35; *Articles of Religion,* 25; *Council of Trent,* Sess. 7.

† *V. Council of Trent,* Sess. 7, Canons 6–8; *Augsburg Confession,* 13; I *Helvetic,* 21; *Gallican,* 38; *Anglican Articles,* 25.

‡ *De Civitate Dei,* 10^5; *in Joan. tract.* 80.

according to the Spirit, baptism is received in vain and is void." (Quest. 39.)

"For as natural food can be of no use to the dead, so in like manner the sacred mysteries can evidently *nothing avail* that soul which lives not by the Spirit." (Quest. 48.)

The Roman Catholics make the sacraments means through which the divine grace works upon the believer; *they contain grace, they confer grace.*

Luther in his *Catechism* says:

"It is not water, indeed, that does it, but the Word of God, which is with and in the water, and faith, which trusts in the Word of God in the water. For without the Word of God the water is nothing but water, and no baptism: but with the Word of God it is a baptism." (Part 4^3.)

"Eating and drinking, indeed, do not do them, but the words which stand here: 'Given and shed for you, for the remission of sins.' Which words, besides the bodily eating and drinking, are the main point in the sacrament; and he who believes these words has that which they declare and mean, namely, *forgiveness of sins.*" (Part 5; *cf.* also *Gallican Confess.* 38.)

One of the best statements is that of the *Westminster Confession.*

"The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers." (27^3.)

There is a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified. That is the Protestant position. Roman Catholics assert that the word of institution carries with it and conveys the work of the divine Spirit to those who use the Sacrament, and are not possessed by invincible obstacles to its reception. When the two positions are defined, it is evident that they are different explanations of the fact agreed to by both, that *the sacraments are real*

means of grace to the worthy recipient. Nothing more should ever have been demanded by either as an article of faith.

The Protestant position is especially open to attack in the Sacrament of Baptism. The early Protestants all maintained *baptismal regeneration.* Calvinists later confined it to *elect infants,* and still later spiritual regeneration was separated in time from the ceremony of baptism. But these later changes in the Calvinistic position do not remove the difficulties. Several questions emerge:

(1) Are the words of institution efficacious of themselves? It is agreed that the words are efficacious only as instituted by Christ, as bearing with them His authority; and also as having in them, according to His promise, the power of the divine Spirit. The practical difference is whether the power of grace is *in* the word of institution or *with* it as accompanying it.

(2) Are the words efficacious apart from the intention to administer the sacrament? All agree that the intention of the minister cannot obstruct the intention of the Church, whose minister he is, provided he uses the formulas of the Church. If, however, he act as an individual, apart from the Church, and without using her forms, his intention may destroy the sacrament.

(3) Are they efficacious apart from a worthy recipient? All agree that there must be no sufficient obstruction in the recipient. He must have the Christian's faith, confessed by himself, or, if an infant, by parent, godfathers, or godmothers. Both Roman Catholics and Protestants agree to this. Thus the *Formula of Concord:*

"Moreover, as concerns the consecration, we believe, teach, and confess that no human work, nor any utterance of the minister of the Church, is the cause of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper; but that this is to be attributed to the omnipotent power of our Lord Jesus Christ alone. Nevertheless, we believe, teach, and confess by unanimous consent, that in the use of the Lord's Supper, the words of the institution of Christ are by no means to be omitted, but are to be publicly recited, as it is written, I Cor. 10^{16}. . . . This benediction takes place by the recitation of the words of Christ." (7^{3-4}.)

§ 3. *The Sacrament of Baptism was agreed to by all as having the element of water, and the form, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." All agreed to infant as well as adult baptism. The differences were as to other ceremonies connected with baptism, which the Roman Catholics regarded as important, but not essential, and which the Protestants rejected in whole or in part as superstitious. All regarded the faith of parents, or of the Church, as competent for the faith of infants.**

Luther abolished the use of salt, spittle, and oil, but retained exorcism in an abridged form.

The Second Helvetic (20^{5}) rejects all ceremonies. The Anglicans retain the signing with the cross, objected to by Puritans.

It is true that the radicals of the Reformation, many of them, objected to infant baptism and insisted upon the limitation of baptism to adults. They rebaptised infants, and so were called Anabaptists. But these sects were outside Historical Christianity and this doctrine does not appear in Christian Symbols till the seventeenth century.

§ 4. *Confirmation was the second sacrament in the mediæval system. The Roman Catholics retain it as a sacrament, many Protestant Churches as a sacred ceremony. Those which retain the episcopate regard confirmation as an episcopal prerogative. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches confirm by the Presbyter, as does the Greek.*

The Council of Trent limits itself to the maintenance that confirmation is a sacrament, and that the ordinary minister of it is the bishop. The Roman Catechism unfolds the Roman doctrine.†

The matter of confirmation is, according to Roman Catholics, *chrism*, an ointment, composed of oil and balsam, consecrated for the purpose by a bishop.

* Compare *Augsburg Confession*, 9; *Gallican*, 35; *Articles*, 27; *Belgic*, 34; *Westminster*, $28^{5\text{-}6}$.

† Sess. 12, Canons 1–3.

The form is: "*I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" (Chapter 3, Quest. 2.)

In the Greek Church the form is: "*The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.*"*

In the Anglican Church the bishop lays his hand on the head of every one to be confirmed, with the words:

"*Defend, O Lord, this Thy child (servant) with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine forever, and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting kingdom.*"

The Lutheran and Reformed Churches simply have the laying on of hands with a sentence and prayer.

Under the influence of Bucer a form was introduced into Hesse,† and Strasburg: "*Receive the Holy Ghost, safeguard and shelter against all malice, strength and help toward all good, from the gracious hand of God the Father.*"

This usage went into Austria and other Churches of the Reformation, and is sacramental in character. The prevailing opinion, however, in both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches was that confirmation was only a ceremony attesting the faith of those who had completed their catechetical training in preparation for the Lord's Supper.‡

A third theory of confirmation is that it is governmental in character, admitting the catechumen to the full privileges of church membership.§

The antagonism is clear from the Canons on *Confirmation* of the *Council of Trent.*

"If any one saith, that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism, whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church: let him be anathema."

* *Orthodoxa Confessio*, Quest. 105; *Larger Catechism*, 308.
† *Kirchenordnung*, 1539. ‡ *V.* Calvin's *Institutes*, IV : 17.
§ Kliefoth, *Die Confirmation, Liturgische Abhand.* III, ss. 83 *seq.*

"If any one saith, that they who ascribe any virtue to the sacred chrism of confirmation, offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost: let him be anathema."

"If any one saith, that the ordinary minister of holy confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest soever: let him be anathema." (Session 7, *On Confirmation,* Canons 1–3.)

Confirmation in the ancient Church and in the Greek Church at present is closely connected with baptism. It has attached to it the laying on of hands, based on apostolic practice, and unction, which arose in the second century in connection with baptism,* based on the use of unction as a consecrating material in the Old Testament. The separation of baptism from confirmation in the West was due to the feeling that the laying on of hands and unction were episcopal functions, influenced also by the acts of confirmation of the apostles in the narrative of Acts in connection with the reception of the Holy Spirit. The Roman Catholic Church retained unction as sufficient; the Reformed Churches reverted to the laying on of hands.

The ceremony of confirmation in the narrative of Acts was an apostolic function, which followed baptism performed by others than the apostles.

The Samaritans had been baptised, but did not receive the Holy Spirit until confirmed by Peter and John by the laying on of hands.† When those converted at Ephesus were baptised, Paul laid his hands upon them and they received the Holy Spirit.‡ On the day of Pentecost and at Cæsarea the Holy Ghost came upon the hearers before the baptism; but the baptism immediately followed, and, although no mention is made of the laying on of hands, it is probable as in the other two cases.§ Thus, while usually the confirmation was closely connected with baptism, yet, according to the two passages given, it was an apostolic function to confirm, and it was deferred in the case of the baptised at Samaria until the arrival of the apostles. This justifies the separation of

* Tertullian, *de baptismo,* VII; *cf.* Cyril, *Mystagogicae Catech.* III, 2–6.
† Acts 8^{14} *seq.* ‡ Acts 19^{5} *seq.* § Acts 2^{1-42}, 10^{44-48}.

the two ceremonies by the Church, especially in the case of infants.

§ 5. *The chief sacramental conflict of the Reformation was as to the Eucharist. There was agreement that it was the chief sacrament of the New Testament, that its matter was bread and wine, that its form was the words of institution, and that only the faithful enjoyed real communion with Christ. The difference was as to the mode of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Roman Catholics maintained that transubstantiation was a proper explanation of the church doctrine of conversion. Luther denied transubstantiation and held to consubstantiation, the Zwinglians to spiritual presence only, Calvin to a substantial presence to faith only.*

The Roman Catholic doctrine is distinctly stated in the Decree of the *Council of Trent.*

"By the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation." (Sess. 13[4]; *cf.* Canons 1–4.)

The Lutheran view is as follows:

"Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the (true) body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine), and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper."—(*Augsburg Confession*, Art. 10.)

"It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given unto us Christians to eat and to drink, as it was instituted by Christ Himself."—(Luther's *Little Catechism*, Pt. V.)

"We believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine." —(*Form. of Concord*, Art. 7, Affirm. 1.)

"We reject and condemn . . . : The papistical transubstantiation, when, to wit, in the Papal Church it is taught that the bread and wine in the holy Supper lose their substance and natural essence, and are thus annihilated, and those elements so transmuted into the body of Christ, that, except the outward species, nothing remains of them." —(*Form. of Concord*, Art. 7, Negative, 1.)

The Lutheran view is called *Consubstantiation* because it holds to the coexistence of two distinct and independent substances sacramentally united in the Eucharist. This does not imply *impanation,* or the inclusion of the one substance within the other, but the sacramental presence of the one substance with the other.

Zwingli and the Swiss especially attacked the idolatry connected with the mass, and they were unwilling to admit the presence of anything divine in the Eucharist that could be worshipped. They asserted that the real body of our Lord was in heaven and could not be in a number of different places on earth. At the Marburg Conference the statement of the agreement and disagreement of the Swiss and Germans is in the *Fifteenth Article.**

Credimus et sentimus omnes de Cœna Domini nostri Jesu Christi quod utraque specie juxta institutionem utendum sit: quod Missa non sit opus quo alter alteri, defuncto aut viventi, gratiam impetret: quod Sacramentum Altaris sit Sacramentum veri corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi, et spiritualis istius veri corporis et sanguinis sumptio præcipue unicuique Christiano maxime necessaria. Similiter de usu Sacramenti consentimus quod, sicut verbum, ita et Sacramentum a Deo traditum et ordinatum sit, ut infirmas conscientias ad fidem et dilectionem excitet per Spiritum Sanctum. Etsi autem an verum corpus et sanguis Christi corporaliter in pane et vino Cœnae Domini præsens sit hoc tempore non concordavimus, tamen una pars alteri Christianam dilectionem, quantum cuiusque conscientia feret, declarabit, et utraque pars Deum omnipotentem diligenter orabit ut nos Spiritu suo in vera sententia confirmet. Amen.

They agreed as to the divine institution of the sacrament, the necessity of partaking of the bread and the wine, consecrated by the words of institution, of partaking of the sacrament in both kinds, of real communion by eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, and as to rejection of the transubstantiation of the Roman Mass. They could not agree upon the corporal presence of Christ.

Bucer and Calvin took an intermediate position which was adopted by all the Reformed Churches and the Church of England, and which is best stated in the Gallican Confession:

* *V.* Schaff, *German Reformation,* p. 646.

"We confess that the Lord's Supper, which is the second sacrament, is a witness of the union which we have with Christ, inasmuch as He not only died and rose again for us once, but also feeds and nourishes us truly with His flesh and blood, so that we may be one in Him, and that our life may be in common. Although He be in heaven until He come to judge all the earth, still we believe that by the secret and incomprehensible power of His Spirit He feeds and strengthens us with the substance of His body and of His blood. We hold that this is done spiritually, not because we put imagination and fancy in the place of fact and truth, but because the greatness of this mystery exceeds the measure of our senses and the laws of nature. In short, because it is heavenly, it can only be apprehended by faith." (36.)

This view recognises a real substantial presence of the body of Christ, but to *faith*, not to the *senses;* not a mere spiritual presence or presence of the spirit of Christ, but a presence of the whole Christ, body and spirit, to the believer, who discerns Him by faith.*

As Schaff says:

"Nitzsch and Köstlin are right when they say, that both Zwingli and Luther 'assume qualities of the glorified body of Christ of which we know nothing; the one by asserting a spacial inclusion of that body in heaven, the other by asserting dogmatically its divine omnipresence on earth.'" †

Indeed, this is the difficulty with all theories of the presence. They all depend upon theories as to the nature of the glorified body of Christ which theologians have neglected to study and which the Church has never defined.

The Council of Trent asserts that our Saviour is

"sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God." (Sess. 13[1].)

They assert that Christ was not only present to the disciples as Himself instituting the sacrament, but also in the bread and wine, which He gave them at the first institution.

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 263 *seq.*

† *German Reformation*, p. 625; *cf.* Köstlin's *Luther*, II, 96, 642; *Luther's Theologie*, II, 172 *seq.*

The presence was also not divided between bread and wine, but in each entire, so in every drop of wine and every particle of bread, the entire Christ. All spacial and arithmetical ideas are excluded.

As the Roman Catechism says of priests:

"They must next teach, that Christ our Lord is not in this sacrament as *in a place*. . . . For the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of Christ, not into His magnitude or quantity." (42.)

The Roman Catholics and Lutherans hold that the glorified body of Christ is not subject to the laws of matter, but is a spiritual glorified body. In the Eucharist it has no local or numerical limitations. Its properties are not discerned by the human senses. It has no weight or measure, no size or shape. It has not the quality of impenetrability. It is the same identical body that was born of the Virgin, lived in Palestine, died on the cross: but when it rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, it became a spiritual and glorified body, capable of multipresence, wherever the Son of God willed to be present.

Zwingli made the mistake of thinking of the body of Christ as locally limited to the right hand of God in heaven, and laid stress upon the recollection of the absent Christ, especially the Christ of the cross, in the Eucharist. In this he was in error. The term "Do this in remembrance of me" is not so well sustained critically as the other words of Jesus at the institution, and in itself is of dubious meaning. Calvin recognised the real, substantial presence; but it is not easy to determine what he meant by it—probably a *dynamic* presence of the glorified body of Christ, and that not to the body of the recipient but to faith only.

As I have said, the problem depends in great part upon the nature of the glorified body of Christ. If we study the body of Christ as it is made known to us in the New Testament, we observe that it was changed at the resurrection. It was visible or invisible, tangible or intangible, impenetrable or penetrable at pleasure, so that we must regard all

the manifestations of the risen Lord as Christophanies. A still greater change was made at the ascension, when His body rose from the earth as without weight, and not subject to the law of gravitation, and disappeared in the sky. We have to consider also the Christophanies to St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, when the same body which was throned at the right hand of the Father manifested itself at the same time on earth, speaking to His apostles. We also have to consider the statement of St. Paul as to the body of the glorified Lord. He says it is a spiritual, heavenly, incorruptible, immortal, and glorious body.* We know of no such body by human experience; therefore we can form only a very imperfect and indefinite opinion of the glorified body of Christ united in indissoluble union with the divine person of the Second Person of the Trinity. How far the human body has been assimilated to the divine nature, how far attributes of divinity have influenced the humanity, we cannot say. If we must, on the one hand, deny that the humanity has been deified, and so possessed of all the attributes of divinity, we must recognise, on the other hand, that human nature is capable of the divine to an indefinite extent and that its capacities and powers must be immensely enhanced. I can see no objection, therefore, to the doctrine of *multipresence*. We know but little of the essential nature of substance or of body. Is it a bundle of forces or of atoms? A spiritual body cannot be a bundle of material atoms. Are there spiritual atoms? If a bundle of forces, there must be a principle of unity, a unifying force. If Calvinists think of dynamic presence, may that not be interpreted as corporal presence? The latter is the better term because it is more comprehensive and leaves the nature of the presence less determinate than the term dynamic presence. Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists ought to agree upon the real, substantial, corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The chief difficulty is as to the relation of the body of Christ to the elements of bread and wine.

* *V.* Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith*, pp. 143 *seq.*

We may be guided to a better understanding of this relation by a comparative study of three distinct Eucharistic relations: (1) The relation of the glorified body of Christ to the elements when St. Paul celebrated the Eucharist at Corinth, in accordance with his statement, I Cor. 11^{23-34}. (2) The relation of the pre-existent body of Christ to the elements when, in the wilderness of the wanderings, Moses celebrated the Eucharist (I Cor. 10^{1-4}). (3) The relation of the body of Christ to the elements at the time of the institution on the night of His betrayal (I Cor. 11^{23-25}).

The same essential relation was in these three Eucharists; the same essential Christ must have been in His pre-existence, in His life in this world, and in His postexistence. It is evident that, if we consider the Eucharist of Moses in the wilderness, and that of the apostles before the crucifixion, in the presence of Christ's human body, we cannot think of any material substance of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. We can only think of some virtue of grace imparted by the Angel of the Presence to the water and the manna for Israel, and by the still living Christ to the bread and the wine which the apostles partook of in His presence; unless we suppose that the relation in all these cases alike was a symbolic one. We have to consider that the manna and the water were both given by the Angel of the Presence as miraculous gifts. They were not ordinary water and manna, but miraculous water and manna. So St. Paul considered them. And he certainly regarded them as miraculous gifts of Christ to the Israelites: so that they ate and drank of something more than manna and water; they also ate and drank of a miraculous virtue or grace that the miracle imparted to these elements. And it was because of this that St. Paul said: "They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ."* By eating of the manna and drinking of the water, they ate and drank spiritual meat and drink; they ate and drank of Christ, the theophanic God of the Old Testament.

* I Cor. 10^{3-4}.

So when Jesus, at the institution of the Eucharist, blessed the bread and the wine, and said, *This is my body*, and *This is my blood of the New Covenant*,* the bread and the wine became eucharistic; they had received a virtue from Christ which they did not have before. We cannot think of a material body, for Jesus was in their presence in a material body; no more can we think of a material blood, because the blood of Christ was not yet shed; we can only think of the virtue of the body and blood, or a power of grace from the body and blood imparted to the bread and the wine. That which is imparted in the Eucharist of St. Paul must be the same. The glorified Christ communicates to the bread and wine of the Eucharist the power of grace, or virtue, of His glorified body for the eating and drinking of the faithful.

The fault of the Calvinistic theory is that it distinguishes too sharply between the grace and the elements. If the eating and drinking is by faith, and the elements are only signs and seals of a grace which accompanies them, why may not the grace be received by faith alone without the use of the elements, as the Quakers and Salvationists think? Spiritual communion with Christ may thus be much better enjoyed apart from the elements than in the use of them. Unless the elements are necessary to the Communion, they have no essential value. But if they are essential, then they must have a grace which cannot be received without them; they must be, indeed, real essential means of grace.

What, then, is the relation of the substance of the body of Christ to the substance of the bread and wine?

Transubstantiation holds that the substance of the body of Christ has displaced the substance of the bread, so that only the accidents of the bread remain. Consubstantiation holds that the two substances coexist in real union. Calvinists hold that the two substances coexist in relative independence, the one to the body, the other to the soul of believers only. The Roman Catholics admit that all the accidents or qualities of the bread are there. Nothing else can

* Mark 14^{22-24}.

be detected by the senses. Can we by reasoning be sure that the substance of the bread is there also? The Protestants contend that where the accidents of bread exist, there the substance exists also; and that accidents without their proper substance are inconceivable and impossible. The Roman Catholics recognise that such a situation does not exist apart from the Eucharist; but they assert that it does exist, in the Eucharist by a miracle, by the divine Christ coming with the substance of His body and taking the place of the substance of the bread and wine in the Eucharist.

The Lutheran view is open to the objection that two heterogeneous substances are so combined that the partaking of the one is necessarily connected with partaking of the other. The Roman Catholic view is in this respect simpler and more in accordance with the character of God, as revealed in the Old Testament, Who abhors mixtures.

The Calvinistic view is open to the objection that two heterogeneous substances coexist without combination; and therefore the question arises, what is the need of the unessential substance when it is only a sign and seal of the essential substance, which may be useful for the immature Christian to fix his faith on the essential, but can have little if any value to the mature, who may feed on Christ by faith without them? In fact, the Calvinists were influenced by these considerations; and the daily and weekly Mass of the Catholics was commonly reduced to a communion service four times in the year, and in many places only once a year.

The differences between the Churches are evidently due more to philosophical opinions as to the nature of substance and body than to Biblical teaching and experimental use of the Sacrament, in which all agree in all essential particulars.

The Roman Catholic *Transubstantiation* depends upon the scholastic distinction between substance and accidents, and can only be understood by the scholastic philosophy. What is substance? If it be essentially force or motion, then there is no sufficient reason against the real presence of the virtue, or power, or grace of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. I

fail to see why that power or grace might not sustain the accidents of bread and wine by assuming their forms, just as in Theophanies and Christophanies various other forms were assumed by Christ. If this be true, then the Eucharist is essentially Christophanic in character.

The Calvinistic theory makes the connection between the bread and the body of Christ so loose that, apart from the faith of the communicant, and after the communion, the elements are no more than common bread and wine. The Anglican Church directs that the elements shall be entirely consumed by the minister and others before leaving the place of communion.

The Lutherans recognise that the connection is so organic that the body of Christ is taken into the mouth with the bread, but does not benefit any but the faithful.

The Roman Catholics hold that after consecration the bread remains the body of Christ until every particle has been consumed and the accidents of bread have disappeared. Hence there is Reservation for the sick and adoration of the reserved Sacrament. I can see no difficulty in the supposition that the virtue of the body of Christ would remain so long as the elements are reserved for pious uses. But it seems unworthy of our Lord that He may not withdraw His presence at will, especially when the elements are to be put to unworthy uses. The difficulties connected with this subject are so very great, that charity is needed in the recognition and toleration of various opinions, and patience to study these profound problems until better solutions are found than any yet known.

The solution of the problem of the presence of Christ depends in great measure upon the solution of the problem of sacrifice.

§ 6. *The second great question as to the Eucharist is whether it is a sacrifice and how far it is a sacrifice. The Roman Catholics hold that it is a real propitiatory sacrifice; this the Protestants all deny.*

The Protestant reformers, in their zeal against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, did not sufficiently consider the words of institution. The term *blood of the covenant* implies that the Eucharist was a sacrifice of the New Covenant. St. Paul* represents it as the Christian Passover and sets it in antithesis with the communion meals offered to idols. There should be no doubt, therefore, that the Eucharist is in some sense a sacrifice of the class of Peace-offerings, including the covenant sacrifice and the Passover.

The Peace-offering is the most primitive sacrifice, and in its original form comprehends the uses of all the later sacrifices. It was in part a *Mincha*, or unbloody sacrifice, consisting of some kind of grain, and in part an animal sacrifice.

The ceremonies were (1) *presentation*, (2) *slaughter*, (3) *use of the flesh and blood at the altar*, (4) *use of the flesh and blood by the offerer*.

The Epistle to the Hebrews represents that Jesus Christ, the great High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, went with His own flesh and blood to the heavenly altar, the Holy of Holies, to abide there as the perpetual sacrifice. The presentation, slaughter of the victim, taking of the flesh and blood to the altar—these three parts of the sacrifice of Christ could only be *once for all*, at His death and ascension to the Father. The use of the flesh and blood at the heavenly altar was, however, perpetual, as the high-priesthood was perpetual.

The Protestant contention that the sacrifice of Christ was made once for all, and therefore cannot be repeated, was entirely right. But in the contention it was often overlooked that it was once for all because it needed no repetition, because the sacrifice once offered went to the heavenly altar to remain there for ever.

So far as the use of the flesh and blood by the offerer is concerned, that also must be perpetual, in order that the successive generations of Christians may enjoy its benefits. In

* I Cor. 5^{7}, 10^{16} *seq.*, 11^{23} *seq.*

the Eucharist, therefore, we have the eating and drinking of the sacrifice offered once for all by Jesus Christ Himself, but of everlasting validity in the heavenly sanctuary. The flesh and blood of Christ are not only always on the heavenly altar, but are also given to Christians in the Eucharist on earth.

When partaken of in the Eucharist, the flesh and blood of Christ are sacrificial flesh and blood; and, so far as the Eucharist is a participation in a sacrifice, it is and must be a sacrifice.

The mode of participation in the Eucharistic flesh and blood of Christ is that of the peace-offering, by eating and drinking of the sacrifice.

The question now arises whether the benefit of the Eucharist is limited to participation in Jesus Christ as a peace-offering. A little consideration makes it evident that this cannot be the case.

Jesus Christ is represented by St. Paul as being also a whole burnt offering;* by St. Paul, St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews as a sin-offering;† and although it is not expressly stated anywhere that He was a trespass-offering, yet this also is implied in the general statements of the Epistle to the Hebrews.‡

If, now, Christ is the fulfilment of the entire sacrificial system of the Old Testament, it is improbable that the benefits of His sacrifice should be limited to the peace-offering.

Inasmuch as participation in His sacrifice is given in the Eucharist, it is altogether probable that that participation involves a share in the entire sacrifice of Christ, that of the sin-offering with its propitiation as well as that of the peace-offering. In this sense we must admit, therefore, that the Eucharist has some features of the propitiatory sacrifice; only here again it is limited to the appropriation and participation in the benefits of that sacrifice by eating and drinking of the sacrificial flesh and blood.

At the Reformation there was a general misconception of

* Eph. 5^{1}. † Rom. 3^{20-26}, 8^{1-4}; I John 2^{1-2}.
‡ Heb. 7^{26-28}, $9^{11-15, 26}$, 10^{1-18}, 12^{10-12}.

the Biblical institutions of sacrifice. The stress laid in the Middle Ages upon the atonement, and the sufferings and death of Christ on the cross, limited the attention to the sin-offering as the propitiatory sacrifice, and so serious mistakes were made on both sides by failure to consider other more ancient, more frequent, and in some respects more important kinds of sacrifice.

The Roman Catholics were more correct than the Protestants because they retained ancient traditional statements, coming down from a period when sacrifices were still offered and so better understood. The reformers were objecting more to popular abuses than to the real doctrine of the Church, as the Augsburg Confession and the Anglican Articles clearly show. They were zealous for the real sacrifice of Christ, which they thought was dishonoured by the repetition of the propitiatory sacrifice by earthly priests.

The Council of Trent, indeed, asserts that Jesus commanded His apostles and their successors to *offer the bread and wine* as an unbloody sacrifice.

> And forasmuch as, in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, Who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross; the Holy Synod teaches, that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy, and find grace *in seasonable aid*, if we draw nigh unto God, contrite and penitent, with a sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence. For the Lord, appeased by the oblation thereof, and granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgives even heinous crimes and sins. For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, Who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different. *The fruits indeed of which oblation, of that bloody one to wit, are received most plentifully through this unbloody one; so far is this from derogating in any way from that.* (Sess. 22^2.)

The Council of Trent is not altogether clear in its statements. It states that Jesus Christ "offered up to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine; and, under the symbols of those same things, He delivered [them] to be received by His apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words, *Do this in commemoration of me*, He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer [them]." (Sess. 22^1.)

The Council apparently uses *offer* here in the sense of *presentation* to God; for the victim had not yet been slain on Calvary. This ceremony of presentation is a part of the ceremony of sacrifice, and so *offer* may be used of it properly. This presentation of the bread and wine as an oblation to God is not with the view that they have any value in themselves, but only in order that they may be accepted by Him and then united to the real sacrifice, the flesh and blood of Christ.

This union is effected according to the Greek and Oriental Liturgies by the action of the divine Spirit, who is invoked by the priest to accomplish this union. In the Latin Mass the prayer is:

"We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be brought up by the hands of Thy Holy Angel to Thy altar on high before the sight of Thy divine Majesty; that as many of us as by this partaking of the altar shall have received the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son, may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction and grace, through the same Christ our Lord."

There can be no doubt that gross views of the sacrifice prevailed in the Western Church before the Reformation, which justified the Protestant opposition. This is most pointedly expressed in the *Articles of Religion:*

"The offering of Christ once made is *that* perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which *it was commonly said* that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." (31.)

Bishop Gore* states that only late in the history of Theology do we find the opinion here rejected. He refers only to a sermon of the late Middle Ages, wrongly attributed to Albert the Great. On the other hand, he shows that the

* *The Body of Christ*, pp. 176–9.

great scholastics teach an entirely different doctrine. The Lombard says: "That which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation because it is a memorial and representation of the true sacrifice and of the holy immolation made once for all upon the Cross" (*Sent.* IV : 12[7]). Thomas Aquinas says: "It is called a sacrifice with reference to what is past: inasmuch as it is commemorative of the Lord's passion which is the true sacrifice. . . . It is a representative image of Christ's passion, as the altar represents the cross on which He was once immolated" (IV : 73[4], 83[1]).

As Gore says:* "It is obvious that the language of dramatic representation easily slides into that of real repetition." That was the situation at the time of the Reformation among many ignorant priests and people, and the Article is correct in its statement: *it was commonly said.*

It cannot be doubted that it was the supposed repetition of the sacrifice of the cross that was blasphemous to them. But in fact this was not then, and never has been, the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The sacrifice of the Eucharist is repeated in a secondary sense only; not a repetition of the death of Christ as a sacrifice, but a repeated participation in the sacrifice once offered yet perpetually on the heavenly altar; a participation because of the coming of the sacrificial flesh and blood of Christ to the altar-table of the Church, whenever the Eucharist is celebrated. The Protestants practically believed the same thing, only they refused the term *sacrifice* because it was associated in their mind with the error mentioned above. A more comprehensive knowledge of the Biblical doctrine of sacrifice really overcomes the antithesis here and shows it to be a strife of words rather than of doctrine.†

§ 7. *Many differences arose as to the administration of the Lord's Supper:* (1) *the withholding of the cup from the people;* (2) *the adoration of the elements;* (3) *the reservation of the ele-*

* *L. c.* p. 175.

† *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 272 *seq.*

ments; (4) *private masses;* (5) *the use of the Latin language;* (6) *various ceremonies and details, most of which were mediæval.*

(1) *The withholding of the cup from the people* originated from a dread of desecrating the blood of Christ by the falling of drops to the ground, or upon the beard. The Greek Church, which administers the bread and wine together in a spoon put by the priest in the mouth of the communicant, overcame the difficulty differently; and the Latin Church always has recognised its propriety, officially at the Council of Florence. The withholding of the cup was contested by the Waldensians, by Wycklif, and by Huss. All Protestants insisted upon its restoration.*

The Roman Church had three interests in this matter: (*a*) to maintain the authority of the Church, which had already decided this question; (*b*) to maintain the sacredness of the elements; (*c*) to maintain the sufficiency of communion under one kind.†

The Protestants insisted upon universal obedience to the commands of the Lord Jesus. But they evidently had not the same sensitiveness to a desecration of the elements as had the Roman Church, because of a different conception of the elements themselves. This indeed determines all the other differences.

(2) *Adoration of the elements.* This was involved in the doctrine of Transubstantiation. If the elements are really Christ Himself, they must be adored. If they are not Christ, to adore them is idolatry. The Lutheran and Anglican Churches kneel at the Communion in reverential worship of Christ really present, but refuse to adore the elements. The Reformed Churches receive sitting or standing, for fear of a suspicion of idolatry. The Church of England was agitated during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by this question. The Puritans objected to kneeling as involving adoration, and indulging the crypto-Romanists.

* *Cf. Augsburg Confession*, Pt. II, Art. 1; II *Helvetic Confession*, 21^{12}; *Articles of Religion*, 30.

† *V. Council of Trent*, Sess. 21.

The Church of England justified itself by what is known as the *Black Rubric:*

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." (At close of *Communion Service*, in Anglican *Book of Common Prayer.*)

This did not satisfy either Puritans, or High Churchmen; and it was not included in the American *Book of Common Prayer.* It really involves the error of Zwingli, that the natural body of Christ is material and local.

This question is closely connected with that of non-communicating attendance. This is urged by Roman Catholics, because thereby those not communicating may still adore the elements. For the same reason it was opposed by the Protestants. Notice to the minister was required in the Church of England; tokens were required in Scotland. But all precautions have disappeared in the Protestant world; and the communion-table is no longer guarded. Any one may attend, and any proper person communicate. Although warning is still given to the impenitent, the matter is left to their discretion.

(3) *Reservation of the elements.* There are two kinds of reservation: one for the communion of the sick and absent, the other for the adoration of the faithful. The former is

defended by the *Council of Trent* as Ante-Nicene; * and undoubtedly the Council is correct. The latter is involved in the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Protestants reject both kinds of reservation and have special services for the communion of the sick. This has long been a controversy in the Church of England. The *Articles* † reject reservation, and the rubric of the *Book of Common Prayer* orders that all the elements be consumed on the spot before the conclusion of the service. The question has again been raised in the Church of England, and the Archbishops were asked to decide the question as a matter of law. They had to decide that reservation was unlawful. But a large number of the clergy disobey the law.

(4) *Private masses* are defended by the *Council of Trent* ‡ but were rejected by all Protestants.§ So Rubric 2 at the close of the Anglican Communion Service:

"And there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion."‖

(5) *The use of the Latin language* in the mass was defended by the Council of Trent,¶ but rejected by the Protestants who insisted that the Holy Communion should be administered in the language of the people.**

However, Rome recognises the rites of the Greek and Oriental Churches, and in Rome itself different languages are used by the representatives of the different rites. The Council of Trent puts the use of the Latin language on the ground of *expediency* only. It is concerned simply to maintain the authority of the Church as to what is expedient and what is not expedient.††

(6) *Various ceremonies of the Eucharist* are defended by the

* Sess. 13^{6}. † Art. 28. ‡ Sess. 22^{6}.

§ *Augsb. Confess.* Pt. II : 3.

‖ This is not in the American Book, however.

¶ Sess. 22^{3}.

** *Augsburg Confession,* Pt. II : 3; *Articles of Religion,* 24.

†† In the United States the English Mass is in the hands of the people and the worshipper may follow the Latin service in his English trans-

*Council of Trent.** We may mention especially: (*a*) *mystic benedictions;* (*b*) *lights;* (*c*) *incense;* (*d*) *vestments;* (*e*) *secret prayers of the priest;* (*f*) *mixture of water and wine;* all mentioned by the Council. Add to these: (*g*) *unleavened wafer;* (*h*) *High and Low Mass;* (*i*) *Pontifical and other special Masses;* (*j*) *processions;* (*k*) *the benediction ceremony;* (*l*) *fasting communion;* (*m*) *liturgies in general and particular.*

(*a*) The Roman Catholics hold that *the benedictions* of the priest bear with them a mystic power of grace. The Protestants regard them as intercessory.

(*b*) *Lights* are preserved by Lutherans and some Anglicans, but not by the Reformed Churches.

(*c*) *Incense* was rejected by Protestants altogether as unlawful, but revived in the Church of England by some of the Anglo-Catholic party.

(*d*) Priestly *vestments* were rejected by Protestants, but revived in some Anglican churches.

The ordinary vestments of the Anglican are not open to the Puritan objection that they are priestly in character. The cassock, surplice, and stole belong to the ancient dress of the ministry, and these are ordinarily worn at Holy Communion. However, some Anglo-Catholics insist upon their right to use priestly vestments and ornaments.

(*e*) *Secret priestly prayers* were rejected by Protestants with the possible exception of the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of the Communion Service of the Church of England.

(*f*) *The mixture of water and wine* is approved by the *Council of Trent* for its symbolism.†

(*g*) *Wafers.* The Greeks use leavened bread, the Latins unleavened, Protestants common bread.

(*h*) *The distinction of High and Low Mass* was rejected alto-

lation. But undoubtedly the use of the same service with the same ceremonies and the same language all over the world makes the Roman Catholic at home in all countries and in every church service.

* Sess. 22^5. The Protestant opposition is given in the *Augsburg Confession*, Pt. II : 3; II *Helvetic*, 21; *Articles of Religion*, 20.

† Sess. 22^7.

gether by Protestants, but has been renewed in the Church of England in high or low Communion.

(*i*) The *Pontifical or Bishop's Mass* was rejected by Protestants. The only difference from the ordinary Mass was in ceremonies. Other special masses, in honor of saints or for the dead, were rejected also.

(*j*) *Processions* with litany were rejected by Protestants, but restored in part in the Church of England.

(*k*) *The Benediction ceremony* is a modern service in the Church of Rome to give the people an opportunity of worshipping Christ in the Host and of being blessed by Him from the Host.

(*l*) *Fasting Communion* has been revived in the Church of England.

(*m*) *Various sacramental liturgies* have always been recognised by Rome as valid. Uniformity is only a matter of propriety. The variety before the Reformation has been reduced for the most part to conformity to the Roman mass. There are many Lutheran and Reformed Liturgies, but the Church of England insisted upon uniformity at the cost of many conflicts and schisms.

§ 8. *The Roman Catholic Church maintains the mediæval doctrine that Penance is a sacrament, its form being, "I absolve thee," pronounced by a priest endowed with the power of the keys; its matter, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, required of all Christians for mortal sins at least once a year in order to salvation.*

Luther recognised Penance as a sacrament in a secondary sense; so do many Lutherans and Anglicans; but most Protestants reject it as a sacrament.*

It is agreed that *Penance* is not a sacrament of the same rank as *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*. It is also agreed that it is necessary for salvation, and has all the parts: contrition, confession, satisfaction, and absolution. The differ-

* *V. Council of Trent*, Sess. 14; Luther's *Little Catechism*, Pt. 4; *Augsburg Confession*, Pt. I, Art. 12; Pt. II, Art. 4.

ence between *Penance* and *Repentance* is verbal, not substantial. It should be agreed that repentance is sacramental in a secondary sense.*

§ 9. *It is agreed that it is necessary to secure absolution for all sins committed after baptism, and that the absolution must come from God Himself. Roman Catholics assert that the priest by Christ's own commission has the power of absolution; and that this absolution is necessary to salvation. Luther and other Protestants recognised the value of ministerial private absolution, but laid more stress upon public absolution. Most Protestants, however, deny priestly absolution, and recognise that the ministry has only authority to declare absolution to the penitent, or to lead the people in penitential prayer with an expression of faith that God gives absolution to the penitent congregation.*†

The Power of the Keys is interpreted by Rome as chiefly priestly power of absolution; by Protestants as chiefly disciplinary. The words of Jesus, Mt. 16^{19}, 18^{18}, John 20^{23}, seem to comprehend both functions.

The priest in the Roman Catholic Church pronounces absolution after auricular confession. Some ministers in the Lutheran and Anglican Churches do the same. All make absolution in some form an initial part of public worship. The difference is, in such cases, whether it is: (1) a priestly authoritative act; (2) a ministerial declaratory act, or (3) a ministerial precatory act of faith.

The *Book of Common Prayer* gives two forms expressing the two ideas:

"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness, and live, (and) hath given power, and commandment, to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins: He pardoneth and absolveth all

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 251 *seq.*

† *V. Augsburg Confession*, Pt. II, Art. 4; *Heidelberg Cat.* Pt. II, Quest. 83–85.

those who (them that) truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel. Wherefore let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance, and His Holy Spirit, that those things may please Him, which we do at this present; and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure, and holy; so that at the last we may come to His eternal joy; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Or this.

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all those who (them that) with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him; Have mercy upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." *

The Mass has an ancient form of precatory absolution: *Indulgentiam, absolutionem, et remissionem peccatorum nostrorum tribuat nobis omnipotens et misericors Dominus.*

§ 10. *It is agreed that contrition is a necessary part of repentance, but there is a difference of opinion as to its nature. Roman Catholics distinguish between contrition and attrition.*

The *Council of Trent* defines contrition "as a sorrow of mind, and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future." (Sess. 14[4].)

The *Heidelberg Catechism* defines it under the title of "the dying of the old man," as "heartfelt sorrow for sin, causing us to hate and turn from it always more and more." (Quest. 89.) There is no difference here.

The *Council of Trent* distinguishes between contrition and attrition thus:

"And as to that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, because that it is commonly conceived either from the consideration of the turpitude of sin, or from the fear of hell and of punishment, it declares that if, with hope of pardon, it exclude the wish to sin, it not only does not make a man a hypocrite, and a greater sinner, but that it is even a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Ghost." (Sess. 14[4].)

* In the *Book of Common Prayer* (English) the first form is given alone for Morning Prayer, the second alone for Holy Communion. In the American Book both are given for Morning Prayer.

There was an emphasis upon contrition by Puritans, Pietists, and Methodists, especially upon the experience of its guilt rather than upon dread of punishment. But undoubtedly there is much practical, if not theoretical, use of attrition among modern Protestants. Undoubtedly attrition has been greatly abused in laxity of morals, especially by Jesuit confessors; yet the discrimination of the Council is just.

§ 11. *It is agreed that confession of sin is necessary. Roman Catholics insist that all mortal sins must be confessed, whether secret or public, in all their particulars. Some Protestants advise it, when the conscience is troubled and needs advice and relief. Most Protestants are opposed to the specification of sins in confession even to God, and disapprove of confession to ministers. All agree, however, that an offender should confess his sin to the person offended.**

Sins are of three kinds: unpardonable, mortal, and venial. Unpardonable sins are not to be forgiven by Church or God. Mortal sins may be public or secret. All must be confessed in auricular confession, according to Roman Catholic doctrine. Public sins must be publicly confessed according to Protestant doctrine, but not private sins. Roman Catholics require auricular confession for public sins, and usually the priest gives absolution without requiring confession before the Church. Certain grave sins are reserved for the decision of bishop or pope. Secret sins may be confessed to God secretly according to Protestant doctrine; but offences against individuals should be confessed to the injured party; and other secret sins to the ministry when help or consolation is needed. All secret mortal sins must be confessed in auricular confession according to Roman Catholic doctrine. General Confession in public worship is required by both Protestants and Catholics; but in addition there is particular confession of particular sins by Roman Catholics to priests, by Protestants in secret to God.

* *Heidelberg Catechism*, Quest. 85; *Westminster Confession*, 15; *Council of Trent*, Sess. 14[5].

Venial sins must be confessed in secret to God; but according to Roman Catholic practice they should also be confessed to the priest. Yet the Church does not require it. Apart from mortal sins, confession to the priest once a year is all that the law of the Church demands. The practice of frequent confession is advisory, not legal. Over-anxiety as to specification, urged by Roman Catholic advisers, especially Jesuits, is opposed by the *Augsburg Confession,* which wisely says:

"But of Confession our churches teach that the enumeration of sins is not necessary, nor are consciences to be burdened with the care of enumerating all sins, inasmuch as it is impossible to recount all sins, as the Psalm (19^{12}) testifies. . . . But if no sins were remitted except what were recounted, consciences could never find peace, because very many sins they neither see nor can remember." (Pt. II, Art. 4.)

§ 12. *Satisfaction is regarded by the Roman Catholics as an essential part of the Sacrament of Penance. It is partly "a medicine of infirmity," and partly "the avenging and punishment of past sins." Protestants deny that satisfaction is a necessary part of repentance, and assert that the satisfaction of Jesus Christ does away with all temporal as well as eternal penalties.*

The question of *satisfaction* originated from the controversy as to Indulgences sold by Tetzel.

Luther's *Ninety-five Theses* were directed against this. Most of the abuses complained of were contrary to Canon Law and Church doctrine, and are against the *Decrees of the Council of Trent.**

Nevertheless, there remained a serious difference between Protestants and Catholics, not only as to Indulgences, but also as to satisfaction.

The *Council of Trent* † gives the Roman Catholic doctrine. It calls attention to chastisements inflicted on penitents in Holy Scripture.‡

* *V.* p. 305. † Sess. 14^{8-9}.

‡ The Roman Catechism (Quest. 61) refers to Gen. 3^{17}; Nu. 12, 20; II Sam. 12^{13}; Ex. 32^{8} *seq.*

It asserts that the priests ought "to enjoin salutary and suitable satisfactions, according to the quality of the crimes and the ability of the penitent; lest, if haply they connive at sins, and deal too indulgently with penitents, by enjoining certain very light works for very grievous crimes, they be made partakers of other men's sins." These satisfactions are "not only for the preservation of a new life, and a medicine of infirmity, but also for the avenging and punishment of past sins."

They are not however the penalties due for sin, and do not at all impair the value of the satisfaction rendered by Jesus Christ. "But not therefore did they imagine that the sacrament of Penance is a tribunal of wrath or of punishments," etc.

The *Roman Catechism* mentions three species of satisfaction: *prayer, fasting, almsgiving,** and asserts that before the priests absolve the penitent, they must

"insist that if, perchance he has culpably injured his neighbour in property, or character, he make abundant reparation for the injury done; for no person is to be absolved, unless he first faithfully promise to restore what belongs to another." (Quest. 73.)

The *Council of Trent* declares that there are three kinds of works of satisfaction:

(1) "Punishments voluntarily undertaken of ourselves for the punishment of sin"; (2) "those imposed at the discretion of the priest"; (3) "temporal scourges inflicted of God."†

Protestants denied that satisfaction was a necessary part of repentance; they did, however, recognise that as a fruit of repentance amends must be made for all wrongs, and that certain chastisements must be submitted to by those under discipline before they were restored to the communion of the Church. Works of all kinds they would exclude from repentance as well as faith; and they would deny that these had any virtue of satisfaction for sin, lest they should impair the satisfaction made for sin by Jesus Christ.

§ 13. *Closely connected with the sacrament of Penance is the doctrine of Indulgences. Luther and Protestants generally agreed that the Church might grant indulgences from ecclesias-*

* Quest. 70.

† Sess. 14[9].

tical penalties. It was also agreed that indulgences could not be granted from the eternal penalties due for sin. The question was as to temporal penalties, both in this world and in purgatory, which had the purpose of chastisement and purification from sin. Roman Catholics asserted the power of the Church to grant indulgences from these, which Protestants denied.

Undoubtedly, very great abuses arose from the doctrine of Indulgences. The Council of Trent recognised these abuses and made a decree for their removal.*

The Council puts the Decree concerning Indulgences after the Decree concerning Purgatory, recognising that the question was about Purgatory chiefly. It is very cautious in the treatment of both questions, and leaves the chief question of controversy open. The *Roman Catechism* has nothing to say about Indulgences.

The question is really as to *indulgences for temporal scourges inflicted by God.*

Protestants and Catholics agree that there are such, and many such, in this life, that should be "borne patiently by us" as being disciplinary in character. But Protestants do not recognise that there can be any indulgence for these; although they recognise the value of petition by the sufferer and intercession by his friends.

It is the temporal scourges inflicted by God in Purgatory, about which there is the great question. Purgatory and the whole doctrine of the Middle State is ignored or denied by most Protestants; and therefore there is no room for discussion of the subject with reference to purgatory; but only as to life in this world. For those who think of a purgatory, or of an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, the disciplinary grace of God extends into that state of existence, and the question must arise as to the relation of the Church in this world to that discipline.

§ 14. *The Roman Catholics make Order or Ordination a sacrament of the Church. They count specifically seven orders,*

* *V.* Sess. 25; *cf.* Luther's *Theses*, 2, 5, 6, 20, 21, 22; *v.* also pp. 162 *seq.*

culminating in the priesthood, the essential order of the Church. Protestants assert the necessity of ordination to the Christian ministry, but deny that Order is a sacrament.

The *Council of Trent** does not specify either form or matter: but in Canon 4 the form implied is: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost.* The matter is by implication the ordaining act, but what exactly constitutes that act is not specified. In the Roman Catholic Church there was indeed a dispute at the time, as to whether it was *the laying on of hands* or the *tradition of the instruments.*

The *Roman Catechism*† makes the matter the handing by the bishop to him who is being ordained "a cup containing wine and water, and a paten with bread"; the form: "*Receive the power of offering sacrifice,*" etc. In this there is a conflict with the best and most ancient testimony in the Church, which makes the form *Receive the Holy Ghost,* and the matter, *the laying on of hands.* The Council of Trent does not determine this question. It plays an important part, however, in the discussion as to the validity of Anglican and other Protestant orders.

The *Council of Trent* ‡ appeals to II Tim. 1^{6-7}, which speaks of grace conferred by the imposition of hands. But the conferring of grace does not make a sacrament; otherwise all the means of grace would be sacraments, including the use of the Bible and prayer.

The *Council of Trent* emphasises *priesthood,* as if that were the essential thing in the Christian ministry. This tends to depreciate the prophetic function which Protestants, on the other hand, emphasise.§

§ 15. *The Roman Catholics claim that marriage is a sacrament. This the Protestants all deny.*

The Roman Catholics translate *μυστήριον*, Eph. 5^{32}, *sacrament,* and seem to base their doctrine upon it.

It is in accordance with their conception of marriage that

* Sess. 23. † Quest. 10. ‡ Sess. 23^{3}.

§ *V.* pp. 257, 271; also Briggs, *Church Unity,* pp. 110 *seq.*

the Roman Catholics regard it as indissoluble, if it has been rightly consummated. They may, for sufficient reasons, declare a marriage invalid; but they cannot recognise a divorce.

Protestants regard marriage as a divine institution, but not as a sacrament. The Council of Trent does not mention the form and matter of marriage.

The form is usually regarded as the pronouncing them man and wife; the matter is the first cohabitation without which the marriage is not consummated. Many differences exist as to the prohibited degrees, in which Roman Catholics follow Lev. 18; so also the Church of England.*

The question of marriage with a *deceased brother's wife* was the great occasion of the English Reformation. The right of dispensation is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church.†

The question of marriage with a *deceased wife's sister* is still mooted in England. The laws as to the *deceased brother's wife* are: Lev. 18^{16}, 20^{21}; an earlier law is in Deut. 25^{5}.

The case of Onan and Tamar is given in Gen. 38^{8}. Jesus' words are in Mt. 22^{23} *seq.*

Divorce for *adultery* is recognised in all Protestant countries on the basis of Jesus' words in Mt. 5^{32}, 19^{9}.

Divorce for *abandonment* is recognised in Lutheran and Reformed Churches.‡

Divorce for many other reasons is recognised in many Protestant countries, and in Roman Catholic countries by civil Law.

Religious marriage can only be regulated by ecclesiastical Law. Civil Marriage must be regulated by civil Law. Ministers should not be the servants of the state in civil marriage ceremonies. They should only celebrate religious marriages. The conflict of State Law and Church Law makes difficulties of many kinds which might be avoided, if min-

* *V.* the last page of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. It is not in the American Book. *V.* also *Westminster Confession*, 24^{4}.

† *Council of Trent*, Sess. 24, Canons 3, 4.

‡ *V. Westminster Confession*, $24^{5, 6}$.

isters should refuse the religious marriage until it has been ratified by civil authorities.

§ 16. *The Roman Catholics make Extreme Unction a seventh sacrament, which all Protestants deny.*

The *Council of Trent* represents that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was regarded by the Fathers "as being the completion not only of penance but also of the whole Christian Life, which ought to be a perpetual penance." *

The matter is "oil consecrated by the bishop"; the form is: *By this holy unction may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed*, etc.† The Sacrament is based on James 5^{14-15}, which recommends the anointing of the sick, with prayer for the remission of sins. The Roman Catholics employ unction for the dying, but the Greeks adhere to the more ancient mode of using it for the healing of the sick. The Council of Trent also takes the Greek position:

"For the thing here signified is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; and *raises up*, and strengthens the soul of the sick person by exciting in him a great confidence in the divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness, and the more readily resists the temptations of the devil *who lies in wait for his heel* (Gen. 3^{15}); and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul." (Sess. 14, *Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction*, 2.)

§ 17. *The Roman Church maintains many ceremonies and pious actions, which are rejected in whole or in part by Protestants.*

(1) *The invocation of the Virgin and of saints* is rejected by all Protestants. The doctrine depends upon the views held as to the future life. Protestants think that the intercession of saints obscures that of Christ. They have no doctrine of a state after death intermediate between death and the resur-

* Sess. 14, *On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*
† *Catechism*, Quest. 5, 6.

rection, in which the intercession of saints would be valuable.*

(2) *The veneration of relics* is rejected by all Protestants. Undoubtedly there was a great amount of superstition connected with these relics in the age of the Reformation, and there is always peril of it.† But there is a natural tendency to honour the relics of great men; and modern Protestants honour the relics of their statesmen and generals; why not those of Christian saints also, ancient as well as modern?

(3) *The use of images* for worship was rejected altogether by the Protestants at the Reformation. It was retained by the Lutherans and Anglicans in their churches for instruction, not for worship.‡

(4) *The distinction of meats* in fasting was revised and reformed by all Protestants.§

(5) *The celibacy of priests* was rejected by all Protestants as a law for the ministry, but retained by Rome.‖ The Greeks and Orientals have married priests, but celibate bishops.

(6) *Pilgrimages* were retained in a reformed way by the Roman Catholics, but given up altogether by Protestants.

(7) *Vows* were reduced and reformed both by Protestants and by Roman Catholics.¶

(8) *Holy days* were reduced and reformed by Lutherans and Anglicans; all but the Sabbath were rejected by Puritans.**

* *Augsburg Confession*, Pt. I : 21; *Articles of Religion*, 22.

† *Theses of Bern*, 7; *Articles of Religion*, 22.

‡ *Theses of Bern*, 8; II *Helvetic Confession*, 4; *Articles of Religion*, 22; *Council of Trent*, Sess. 25.

§ *Augsburg Confession*, Pt. I : 15; II : 5; *Articles of Zwingli*, 24; II *Helvetic Confession*, 24.

‖ *Augsburg Confession*, II: 2; *Articles of Zwingli*, 28; *Theses of Bern*, 9; *Articles of Religion*, 32; *Council of Trent*, Sess. 24, Can. 9.

¶ *Augsburg Confession*, I : 15; II : 6.

** *Augsburg Confession*, I : 15; *Articles of Zwingli*, 25; II *Helvetic Confession*, 24.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINES OF FAITH AND MORALS

The Faith of the Reformation, as we have seen in our study of the principles of the Reformation, especially emphasised the doctrine of divine authority and the application of divine grace to the individual through justification by faith. The entire Faith of the Church was considered and debated from these points of view.

We have already studied the doctrine of divine authority as the fundamental religious principle. We have now to study first of all the doctrine upon which there was the greatest discussion; namely, the justification of the sinner by God. Then from the point of view of this doctrine we shall be able to study all the others.

We have already seen that the Church of Rome and the three great Churches of the Reformation all alike reaffirm their adherence to the Faith of the ancient Church as expressed in the Nicene Creed; and all alike agree to the inherited Augustinian doctrines of sin and grace, and the Anselmic doctrine of the atonement in all essential particulars, rejecting all the ancient Trinitarian and Christological heresies, as well as Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. These doctrines therefore will only come into our study so far as they were modified by the new light cast upon them by the deeper study of the application of the divine grace and the atonement of Christ to the individual.

§ 1. *The great material principle of the Reformation was the justification of the sinner by the prevenient grace of God, applying to him the merits of Jesus Christ the Saviour.*

The three chief things in this doctrine are: (1) divine justification, (2) the prevenient grace of God, (3) the merits of Jesus Christ. In these all the great Churches of the Reformation, Protestant and Catholic, are in agreement. In this they all make a decided advance in the definition of the Christian doctrine beyond the pre-Reformation Church.

It is sufficient to quote the Council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession. The Council of Trent says:

"The beginning of said justification is to be derived from the prevenient grace of God through Jesus Christ." (Sess. 6^5.)

"God justifies the impious by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (6^6.)

"The meritorious cause (of justification) is His most beloved Only-begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, who when we were enemies, for the exceeding love wherewith He loved us, merited justification for us by His most holy Passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction for us unto God the Father." (6^7.)

The article of the Augsburg Confession is brief and does not raise difficult questions.

"Also they teach that men cannot be justified [obtain forgiveness of sins and righteousness] before God by their own powers, merits or works; but are justified freely [of grace] for Christ's sake through faith, when they believe that they are received into favour, and their sins forgiven for Christ's sake, who by His death hath satisfied for our sins. This faith doth God impute for righteousness before Him. Rom. 3 and 4." (Pt. I, Art. 4.)*

The only thing the *Responsio* of the Roman party objects to in the article on Justification of the Augsburg Confession is the clause: "by their own powers, merits or works." It denies that these in any way depreciate the merits of Christ, but asserts that they have some value in our justification in accordance with the following passages of Scripture: II Tim. 4^{7-8}; Mt. 5^{3-12}; II Cor. 5^{10}; Mt. 25; Gen. 15^1; Is. 40^{10}; Gen. 4^9; Mt. 20^4; I Cor. 3^8, which it quotes.

* *Cf. Heidelberg Catechism*, 56; *Articles of Religion*, 11; II *Helvetic Confession*, 15.

Human merit in connection with justification is undoubtedly excluded by the Protestant definition of justification, but not by the Roman Catholic definition. This difference of definition does not appear in the Augsburg Confession, except by implication from the difference as to human merit and the interpretation of "through faith" as through faith *alone*, to the exclusion of works and love. These differences will be discussed later on. But, as to the three great fundamental parts of the doctrine the Roman Catholics and Protestants are in accord.

§ 2. *Justification has two sides, a negative and a positive: the negative, the forgiveness of sins; the positive, the justification of the sinner.*

The Roman Catholics and Protestants are agreed as to this part of the doctrine.

Justification "is not remission of sins merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man through the voluntary reception of the grace and of the gifts, whereby man of unjust becomes just, and of an enemy a friend, that so he may be an heir according to hope of life everlasting" (*Council of Trent*, Sess. 6[7]).

"Obtain forgiveness of sins and righteousness before God." (*Augsburg Confession*, Pt. I, Art. 4.)

There have been Protestants who make justification simply the forgiveness of sins, and deny the imputation or impartation of Christ's righteousness; but such a doctrine was rejected by the Formula of Concord, as we shall see later.

§ 3. *Protestants regard justification as an act of God, essentially forensic and declarative in character, an imputation of righteousness; Roman Catholics regard this justification as a work of God, a process of making the sinner righteous by the infusion of righteousness.*

This difference does not appear in the Augsburg Confession, except so far as it may be inferred from the use of the word *impute*. But that is a Biblical term that Roman

Catholics would not object to, except so far as justification was limited to such imputation. Luther and Melanchthon, and the Protestants generally, insisted upon justification as altogether forensic and an imputation of righteousness. The Council of Trent says:

"We, being endowed by Him, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and we are not only *reputed* but are truly called, and are just, receiving justice within us, each one according to his own measure, which the Holy Ghost distributes to every one as He wills, and according to each one's proper disposition and co-operation." (6^7.)

In all the efforts for reunion this question was prominent. At the conference at Ratisbon the intermediate party proposed a double justification, in accordance with the two different senses of justification in the Bible; and it seemed for a while as if concord would be reached on this subject; but the concord was only temporary, and the two antithetic opinions prevailed and became symbolical.*

The Formula of Concord states the Lutheran view.

"For His obedience's sake alone we have by grace the remission of sins, are accounted holy and righteous before God the Father, and attain eternal salvation." (Art. 3^4.)†

But the Formula of Concord is troubled over the use of the words *Regeneration* and *Vivification* in the *Apology* of the *Augsburg Confession,* and represents that they are used in two different senses: the one equivalent to justification, the other "of the renewing of man, which is rightly distinguished from the justification of faith" (3^5). Indeed, several Lutheran divines, as Osiander and Schwenckfeld, refused to limit justification to imputation and urged the infusion of Christ's righteousness; so also the Quakers of the seventeenth century.

If now we compare the chapters in the Westminster Confession, on Effectual Calling (10) and Sanctification (13), it

* Pastor, *Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen,* 1879, ss. 245 *seq.*

† *Cf. Gallican Conf.* 18; *Westminster Conf.* 11^1.

becomes evident that the Confession attaches the work of the Spirit within the soul of man to these doctrines and excludes it from justification itself (11), and limits justification to the "imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ."

The difference therefore is more nominal than real: for both Roman Catholics and Protestants recognise imputation and infusion; the former includes both under justification, the latter assigns the one to justification, the other to sanctification. The difference is one of definition and classification of the operations of divine grace.

§ 4. *All Protestants assert that justification is by faith only, to the exclusion of external works and also of internal graces of the spirit. Roman Catholics claim, on the contrary, that justifying faith cannot be separated from hope and love, which are infused at once and together by the Holy Spirit in the justified one.*

The Council of Trent says:

"By the merit of that same most holy Passion, the charity of God is poured forth by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those that are justified, and is inherent therein: whence man, through Jesus Christ in whom he is ingrafted, receives in the said justification, together with the remission of sins, all these infused at once, faith, hope and charity. For faith, unless hope and charity be added thereto, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of His body. For which reason it is most truly said, that Faith without works is dead and profitless." (6[7].)

The Augsburg Confession says:

"Also they teach that this Faith should bring forth good fruits, and that men ought to do the good works commanded of God, because it is God's will, and not on any confidence of meriting justification before God by their works. For remission of sins and justification is apprehended by Faith." (Pt. I, Art. 6.)

Good works are the fruits of Faith and are not included with Faith as a condition of remission of sins. This puts the difference mildly and chiefly from the point of view of

merit, which will be considered later. We have here only to consider the implication that Faith *only* is the instrumental cause of justification, to use the more technical terminology of the Formula of Concord when it says:

"We believe, also teach and confess, that Faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold on Christ the Saviour, and so in Christ lay hold on that righteousness which is able to stand before the judgment of God; for that faith, for Christ's sake, is imputed to us for righteousness. Rom. 4^5." (3^3.)

The difference is not so great as it appears to be, for the Council of Trent says:

"The instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which none was ever justified." (6^7.) "And whereas the apostle saith, that man is *justified by faith* and *freely*, those words are to be understood in that sense which the perpetual consent of the Catholic Church hath held and expressed, to wit: that we are therefore said to be *justified by faith* because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and the root of all justification." (6^8.)

If Faith is the *root* of justification, as the Roman Catholics teach, and all Christian graces spring from that root, how does that differ from the Protestant teaching, that good works are the *fruits of faith?* The difference here is reduced again to the definition of justification itself. According to Roman Catholic doctrine it begins with imputation and faith, but is carried on with infusion and the fruits of faith, which latter belongs according to Protestant doctrine rather to sanctification. The Anglican statement is most excellent:

"Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith, insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit." (Art. 12.)

The Westminster Confession also says:

"Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love." (11^2.)

There is thus no difference between the Churches as to the relation of Faith and the graces of hope and love, but only as to their relation to justification. There is no separation of Faith and these graces in fact or in time, but only in order. If justification is a work including sanctification, the Roman Catholic statement is certainly correct; if it is a momentary act, the Protestant position is correct. It cannot be doubted that in the New Testament Justification is used in both senses; and therefore both Protestants and Catholics are correct, and they ought to get together and agree on their terminology.

§ 5. *The Roman Catholics make baptism the instrumental cause of justification, through which the justifying grace of God is infused by regeneration. Thereby the original righteousness, lost at the Fall, is restored by the grace of God. Protestants ordinarily separate justification from baptism and regeneration.*

The Roman Catholic doctrine is definite and clear.* But the Lutherans are not so clear in their idea of the relation of justification to regeneration and baptism.† The Reformed Churches are not clear either.‡

The Westminster Confession puts regeneration under effectual calling, and states that God justifies those whom He effectually calls (10, 11).

While effectual calling precedes or, at all events, accompanies justification: it is not an act but a process; and therefore includes more than justification and passes over into the sphere of sanctification and the internal change of the soul of man. So also regeneration is more than justification, because it changes the nature of man and begins the process

* *Council of Trent*, Sess. 6^7.
† Luther's *Little Catechism*, 4; *Formula of Concord*, 5.
‡ *French Confession*, 22; *Articles of Religion*, 27.

of sanctification. Regeneration was attached to baptism by the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic divines, and has been separated from it only since the Pietistic and Methodistic movements of the eighteenth century.

The Roman Catholics attach effectual calling and regeneration to justification. If they are separated and distinguished from justification, and justification is regarded as merely a putative act of God, the Protestant position is justified; but if they are combined with justification, the Roman doctrine is correct.

There is then no real disagreement as to the realities, but only as to doctrinal explanations.

§ 6. *Catholics and Protestants agreed in the Augustinian doctrine that the sin of our first parents resulted in the loss of original righteousness and in the guilt of transgression, not only for themselves but for all their posterity. Roman Catholics assert that the original righteousness was a* donum superadditum, *a gracious supernatural endowment; whereas Protestants claim that it belonged to man as a natural endowment.*

The Council of Trent discussed original sin in the fifth Session immediately before justification, as if it considered that a more fundamental doctrine upon which justification depends; and so in fact it is.

The Roman Catholic doctrine adheres strictly to the Augustinian doctrine of original sin as held by the Church for a thousand years before the Reformation. The Council represented that Adam "lost the holiness and justice wherein he had been constituted" (5[1]); that his loss and guilt were transmitted to his posterity (5[2]); and cannot be taken away "by any other remedy than the merit of the one Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ" (5[3]); that "by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted," and nothing but concupiscence remains, which "the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in those born again, but because it is of sin and inclines to sin" (5[5]).

The Augsburg Confession is brief and ambiguous where it says:

"Also they teach that, after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in Him, and with fleshly appetite; and that this disease, or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit." (Pt. I, Art. 2.)

The *Responsio* of the Catholics finds fault with it only as attributing to infants what really are sins of adults, and criticises Luther for teaching that concupiscence remains a sin after baptism. Melanchthon in his Apology explains the Confession as teaching here that infants by natural birth lack the ability of fearing and trusting God. But, as Möhler states, that makes the difference more evident; for Roman Catholics teach that all that was lost by the Fall was supernatural grace, whereas the Protestants assert that the natural ability to fear God and trust Him was lost.

This difference of the Protestant from Catholic doctrine does not appear in the Augsburg Confession; but really it was one of the most important ones, as is evident from the conferences concerning reunion. After considerable debate, the irenic divines came to a temporary agreement on this subject of original sin at the conference of Worms, 1541.* But the agreement was only provisional, and the antithetical positions developed as follows:

(1) The Protestants held that original sin was not merely a loss of the supernatural endowment of man with the grace of God, but also of his natural endowment as a man created in the image of God; (2) that it was not merely a loss, but also a positive corruption of the whole nature resulting in total depravity; (3) that original sin was not removed by baptism, but only forgiven; (4) that concupiscence was really and in fact sin after baptism.

The Protestant position is well summarised in the Belgic Confession.

* Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, ss. 216–7.

"We believe that, through the disobedience of Adam, original sin is extended to all mankind; which is a corruption of the whole nature, and an hereditary disease, wherewith infants themselves are infected even in their mother's womb, and which produceth in man all sorts of sin, being in him as a root thereof; and therefore is so vile and abominable in the sight of God that it is sufficient to condemn all mankind. Nor is it by any means abolished or done away by baptism; since sin always issues forth from this woful source, as water from a fountain: notwithstanding it is not imputed to the children of God unto condemnation, but by His grace and mercy is forgiven them." (Art. 15.)*

In all these differences the Protestants emphasised and exaggerated Original Sin to an extent and degree unknown before in the Church. This subject gave trouble to both Lutheran and Reformed theologians in the differences that arose among them, which will have to be considered later. It may be regarded as significant that Möhler begins his discussion of the differences between the Churches with two chapters on original sin;† and that it is the Protestant rather than the Roman Catholic doctrine that conflicts with modern Anthropology.

§ 7. *The Roman Catholics claimed that the prevenient divine grace is an assisting grace, with which the free will of man co-operates in repentance as a preparation for the grace of justification. Luther, Calvin, and most Protestants denied this power of co-operation in man, and asserted that justification was by the divine grace only.*

This is a difference between high Augustinianism and low Augustinianism. The Melanchthonians and Arminians took essentially the Roman Catholic position, the Formula of Concord an intermediate one. There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholics adhered to the consensus of the Church before the Reformation; and that the Protestants represented a doctrine recognised as valid, but not as the teaching of the Church. The Augsburg Confession as composed by Melanchthon does not teach anything on this matter of

* *Cf. Gallic. Confession*, 9–12; *Articles of Religion*, 9.

† Möhler, *Symbolik*, ss. 25–98.

assisting grace, or the co-operating free will; and Lutheranism has not, in fact, followed Luther in his high Augustinianism but has endeavoured to take an intermediate position.

It is agreed that man is unable to do anything toward his salvation without the divine grace, and that there is preparatory grace as well as effectual grace. The question is simply this: whether man is purely passive to the efficacious grace of God or whether he is active, not before grace or after grace, but in the grace itself. Thus the Council of Trent:

"While God touches the heart of man by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, neither is man himself utterly inactive while he receives that inspiration, forasmuch as he is also able to reject it; yet is he not able, by his own free will, without the grace of God, to move himself unto justice in His sight." (6[5].)

The Symbols of the Reformation ignore this antithesis. It comes into prominence later.

§ 8. *Sanctification may be considered either as consecration or as a perfecting. In the former sense the Roman Catholics identify it with the positive side of justification. The Protestants carefully distinguish sanctification even in this sense from justification. The Roman Catholics also assert an increase of justification, which corresponds with a perfecting sanctification.*

The whole question of sanctification was left in a very obscure and unsatisfactory condition at the time of the Reformation and, indeed, subsequently till the present time. For it was not clearly distinguished from justification by the Roman Catholics, and the Protestants were so intent upon the separation of the two and upon emphasising justification to the extent of identifying it with salvation that they neglected to study and unfold the doctrine of sanctification. The Council of Trent distinctly identifies sanctification with justification, regarding it as the "Increase of Justification," thus:

"Having therefore been thus justified, and made the friends and domestics of God, advancing from virtue to virtue, they are renewed, as the apostle says, day by day; that is, by mortifying the members of their own flesh, and by presenting them as instruments of justice unto sanctification, they, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church, faith cooperating with good works, increase in that justice which they have received through the grace of Christ, and are still further justified." (6^{10}.)

The Belgic Confession gives the best Protestant statement of sanctification of the period of the Reformation.

"We believe that this true faith, being wrought in man by the hearing of the Word of God and the operation of the Holy Ghost, doth regenerate and make him a new man, causing him to live a new life, and freeing him from the bondage of sin. Therefore it is so far from being true, that this justifying faith makes men remiss in a pious and holy life, that on the contrary, without it they would never do anything out of love to God, but only out of self-love or fear of damnation. Therefore it is impossible that this holy faith can be unfruitful in man: for we do not speak of a vain faith, but of such a faith as is called in Scripture a faith that worketh by love, which excites man to the practice of those works which God has commanded in His Word. Which works, as they proceed from the good root of faith, are good and acceptable in the sight of God, forasmuch as they are all sanctified by His grace." (Art. 24.)

Still better is the statement of sanctification in the Westminster Confession, chapter 13. But even here its relation to justification is not clear, no attention is given to the two kinds of sanctification, and modern Presbyterians have not as a body held to the doctrine.

John Wesley, the Oberlin Theology, the Methodists, and the Salvation Army have more advanced conceptions of this subject; but they do not state their opinions clearly and in dogmatic forms, and these have not become symbolical. Some Methodists and Plymouth Brethren assert immediate sanctification, thinking of the consecrating sanctification or of some particular stage in the progress of sanctification, as, for example, in the experience of holy love and absence of the consciousness of known sin.

It is important that there should be a clear distinction between the consecrating sanctification, which is identified with regeneration, and the perfecting sanctification which is progressive during the Christian's life and only perfected after death in the Intermediate State.*

§ 9. *The Roman Catholics maintained that the justified were able by divine grace to keep the commandments of God, and that good works were obligatory and necessary to final salvation. Protestants claimed that good works were not necessary to salvation, though they were the fruits of a living faith.*

The Council of Trent says:

"But no one, how much soever justified, ought to think himself exempt from the observance of the commandments; no one ought to make use of that rash saying, one prohibited by the Fathers under an anathema—that the observance of the commandments of God is impossible for one that is justified. For God commands not impossibilities, but, by commanding, both admonishes thee to do what thou art able, and to pray for what thou art not able, and aids thee that thou mayest be able; whose commandments are not heavy, whose yoke is sweet and whose burden is light." (6[11].)

The antithesis is not so much with the Protestant Confessions as with Protestant theologians. Thus the Augsburg Confession says:

"Moreover, ours teach that it is necessary to do good works; not that we may trust that we deserve grace by them, but because it is the will of God that we should do them. By faith alone is apprehended remission of sins and grace. And because the Holy Spirit is received by faith, our hearts are now renewed, and so put on new affections, so that they are able to bring forth good works." (Pt. I, Art. 20.)†

The question is not as to the obligation to obey the divine commands, but as to our ability to obey them perfectly in this life. The Council is certainly correct in asserting that "God commands not impossibilities," and that any lack of

* Briggs, *Church Unity*, pp. 338 *seq.*

† So essentially the *Articles of Religion*, 12 (*v.* p. 315).

ability in man is supplied by grace, if sought diligently by prayer and effort of obedience. The Protestants think too much of salvation in its beginning, and of the limitation of opportunity by death, and of the experience of imperfection in mankind, even the best. It is easier for the Roman Catholics to think of Christian perfection because they are looking more at the goal, the ultimate tribunal of Christ, and the progression of salvation in the Intermediate State after death.

The Council of Trent in its Canons says:

"If anyone saith, that the commandments of God are, even for one that is justified and constituted in grace, impossible to keep: let him be anathema." (18.)

"If anyone saith, that the man who is justified and how perfect soever, is not bound to observe the commandments of God and of the Church, but only to believe; as if indeed the Gospel were a bare and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments: let him be anathema." (20.)

The Council of Trent undoubtedly stands for the teachings of the Bible, both the Old Testament and the New. To deny the obligation of the divine Law is Antinomianism, which genuine Protestantism has always repudiated. To deny the possibility of keeping the commandments impeaches the divine justice of requiring of us more than we are able to do, and cuts the nerve of human effort, for man will not attempt impossibilities.

§ 10. *Another difference arose as to the question of merit and works of supererogation; both of which the Catholics asserted, and both of which all Protestants denied.*

The Augsburg Confession rejects the doctrine of human merit as conflicting with the merit of Christ:

"He therefore, that trusteth by his works to merit grace, doth despise the merit and grace of Christ, and seeketh by his own power, without Christ, to come unto the Father. . . . Formerly men's consciences were vexed with the doctrine of works; they did not hear any comfort out

of the Gospel. Whereupon conscience drove some into the desert, into monasteries, hoping there to merit grace by a monastic life; others devised other works whereby to merit grace, and to satisfy for sin. There was great need therefore to teach and renew this doctrine of faith in Christ; to the end that fearful consciences might not want comfort, but might know that grace and forgiveness of sins and justification are received by faith in Christ. . . . Moreover ours teach that it is necessary to do good works; not that we may trust that we deserve grace by them, but because it is the will of God that we should do them." (Pt. I, Art. 20.)

The Gallican Confession says:

"We therefore reject all other means of justification before God, and without claiming any virtue or merit, we rest simply in the obedience of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to us as much to blot out all our sins as to make us find grace and favour in the sight of God." (18.)

The Council of Trent is very careful in its statement as to human merit:

"Neither is this to be omitted,—that, although in the sacred writings so much is attributed to good works that Christ promises that even he that shall give a drink of cold water to one of His least ones, shall not lose his reward; and the apostle testifies that, that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; nevertheless God forbid that a Christian should either trust or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose bounty towards all men is so great, that He will have the things which are His own gifts to be their merits. And forasmuch as in many things we all offend, each one ought to have before his eyes as well the severity and judgment as the mercy and goodness (of God); neither ought anyone to judge himself, even though he be not conscious to himself of anything; because the whole life of man is to be examined and judged, not by the judgment of man, but of God, who will *bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise from God*, Who, as it is written, *will render to every man according to his works*." (6[16].)

The Protestants were chiefly concerned to rule out human merit in the article of Justification. The Roman Catholics could do that, so far as the Protestants' limitation of justi-

fication to the single act of God in initiating man's salvation was concerned; but they could not do it when they regarded justification as comprehending the whole process of grace. The discussion as to merit is therefore from two entirely different points of view. Furthermore, the Protestant arguments against human merit are chiefly from the abuses of good works in the Church at the time of the Reformation, and do not affect the doctrine of merit itself.

The Council of Trent easily brushes aside the Protestant objections to human merit when it is properly defined. Human merit is not at all involved in the pardon of sin, regeneration, or the initial act of justification, but solely and alone in the good works that are the fruit of faith.

The Belgic Confession in the following statement does not differ appreciably from the Council of Trent:

"In the meantime we do not deny that God rewards good works, but it is through His grace that He crowns His gifts." (Art. 24.)

The question of merit does not depend upon the prior fulfilment of all the requirements of God, but upon the ability of man to do acts of love and self-sacrifice that are not required by the commands of God. Thus there may be merit for such works as are not commanded at the same time that there is demerit for failure to do the works required, or even for transgression of the commandments of God. This does not in the slightest degree impair the merits of Jesus Christ. As the Council of Trent says:

"If anyone saith that, by the Catholic doctrine touching Justification, by this holy Synod set forth in this present decree, the glory of God, or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ are in any way derogated from, and not rather that the truth of our faith and the glory in fine of God and of Jesus Christ are rendered illustrious: let him be anathema." (Sess. 6, Canon 33.)

The question of works of supererogation does not appear in the definitions of the Council of Trent; but it was prominent in the discussions of the theologians, especially in con-

nection with the doctrine of indulgences. *The Articles of Religion* have the strongest Article against them.

"Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants." (14.)

The reference to Luke 17^{7-10} is without force; for there can be no works of supererogation that are commanded, but only those "over and above God's commandments." No one can understand the ethical teaching of Jesus who does not discern His discrimination between lawful, obligatory service and that of voluntary Christian love, Godlike and Christlike. It is only in the sphere of voluntary acts of love that supererogation is possible and real merit is acquired.*

So Hermas gives the primitive Christian doctrine based on the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, in which there was a consensus of the Church until the Reformation, when he says:

"If thou doest anything good outside of the commandments of God thou wilt gain for thyself more abundant glory and thou wilt be of more repute with God than thou wert about to be."—(*Similitudes*, V : 3^3.)

The abuse of the counsels of perfection in the times of the Reformation did not justify their rejection.

§ 11. *Another difference arose as to the loss of the grace of justification and its recovery. This the Catholics asserted, but many Protestants denied, insisting upon a justification once for all.*

The Council of Trent says:

* Briggs, *Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 207 *seq.*

"As regards those who, by sin, have fallen from the received grace of Justification, they may be again justified, when, God exciting them, through the sacrament of penance, they shall have attained to the recovery, by the merit of Christ, of the grace lost." (Sess. 6^{14}.)

The Catholic position involves a series of justifications. The second justification and later ones, according to Roman Catholic teaching, are given through the Sacrament of Penance.

This difference does not appear in the Augsburg Confession, but later when the Calvinists insisted upon the *Perseverance of the Saints* over against the Arminians. Indeed, the Arminian doctrine really implies a renewal of justification; and Fletcher, the chief theologian of the Wesleyans, does not hesitate to teach it in his *Checks to Antinomianism.*

§ 12. *Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed that the life of man should be a state of continuous repentance; on the negative side a turning away from sin, and on the positive side a turning unto God. They differed as to the necessity of auricular confession and absolution in order to the grace of repentance.*

The Council of Trent on *the Sacrament of Extreme Unction* and Luther's First Thesis agree that the whole Christian life ought to be a perpetual penance or repentance, and that repentance has the two sides of turning away from sin and turning unto God. The difference is not as to the spiritual grace, but as to the external actions which express it: whether auricular confession is necessary, and as to the priestly function of absolution, and compensation for wrong-doing, all of which have been considered in the chapter on the Sacraments.

§ 13. *Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed as to the final state of heaven and hell after the resurrection and as to the determination of the future life in its main directions by the life in this world. They differed as to the state between death and the resurrection. The Roman Catholics asserted that it was a purgatory for all the redeemed who had not rendered sufficient*

satisfaction by temporal punishment. This the Protestants denied.

The question of the future life was involved in the doctrine of Penance, especially in the part of Satisfaction. If sufficient satisfaction by temporal punishment or discipline had not been rendered in this life, it must be completed in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. We have seen in our study of the Descent into Hell of the Apostles' Creed that the ancients held to the continuation of the processes of redemption after death, in Hades.* The emphasis upon satisfaction by temporal punishment or chastisement, prior to the Reformation, involved necessarily the continuation of that satisfaction in Hades. It was in mediæval usage called Purgatory, because purgation of sins was emphasised rather than the completion of sanctification. At the same time it cannot be said that theologians altogether lost sight of the process of sanctification in that state of existence.

Undoubtedly, many abuses and errors existed in the time of the Reformation in connection with the doctrine of Purgatory; but that did not justify the Protestants in so greatly neglecting that doctrine or in denying the Roman Catholic doctrine without putting anything in its place. The Protestant Symbols of the period of the Reformation ignore the Middle State altogether. The *Articles of Religion* content themselves with saying that "The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory . . . is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God" (Art. 22); but they do not give us any other doctrine in place of it. The Council of Trent is cautious in its statement of this doctrine:

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught, in sacred Councils and very recently in this œcumenical Synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable

* *V.* pp. 63 *seq.*

sacrifice of the altar—the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the Holy Fathers and Sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated multitude." (Sess. 25.)

The Greek Church holds to the same doctrine in *The Longer Catechism,* which clearly states, with reference to the souls of the faithful in Hades:

"That they may be aided toward the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory." (376.)

This doctrine is grounded:

"On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church; the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabeus offered sacrifice for his men that had fallen (2 Macc. 12[43]). Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the divine liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the Apostle James. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: '*Very great will be the benefit to those souls for which prayer is offered at the moment when the holy and tremendous Sacrifice is lying in view.*' (*Lect. Myst.* V : 9.) St. Basil the Great, in his prayers for Pentecost, says that the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers and sacrifices *for those that are kept in Hades,* and allows us the hope of obtaining for them *peace, relief, and freedom.*" (377.)

There are differences as to the details of the doctrine between the East and the West, but the symbolic definitions are the same.

The Protestant theologians unanimously rejected the common Roman Catholic doctrine of satisfaction for sin after death, and usually also prayers for the dead, but some of the masters of Theology have looked upon the Middle State as a period of growth in grace and sanctification. Thus John Calvin says:

"As, however, the Spirit is accustomed to speak in this manner in reference to the last coming of Christ, it were better to extend the advancement of the grace of Christ to the resurrection of the flesh. For although those who have been freed from the mortal body do no longer contend with the lusts of the flesh, and are, as the expression is, beyond the reach of a single dart, yet there will be no absurdity in speaking of them as in the way of advancement, inasmuch as they have not yet reached the point at which they aspire, they do not yet enjoy the felicity and glory which they have hoped for, and, in fine, the day has not yet shone which is to discover the treasures which lie hid in hope. And, in truth, when hope is treated of, our eyes must always be directed forward to a blessed resurrection as the grand object in view."—(Calvin on Phil. 1^6.)

So also John Wesley says:

"Can we reasonably doubt but that those who are now in Paradise in Abraham's bosom, all those holy souls who have been discharged from the body from the beginning of the world unto this day, will be continually ripening for heaven, will be perpetually holier and happier, till they are received into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world?"—(*Works*, CXXVI, *Sermon on Faith.*)

I have endeavoured to open up this side of the doctrine of the Middle State by teaching progressive sanctification after death. The unpreparedness of the American Presbyterian Church for this doctrine, which the Christian Church has held from the beginning, was manifest by their rejection of it as a heresy at the General Assembly in Washington in 1893.*

§ 14. *The Protestants and Catholics agreed in the Anselmic doctrine of the atonement in all essentials:* (1) *that Christ's death was a satisfaction for the sins of the world, and* (2) *that Christ's merit is the only ground of our salvation. They differed in their opinion whether these doctrines were compromised by the institutions and practice of the Roman Church.*

As we have seen, the Anselmic doctrine of the atonement won the consensus of the Mediæval Church; but there was no symbolic definition of the doctrine until the Reforma-

* *Defence of Professor Briggs*, pp. 151 *seq.*

tion, when it appears in all the Confessions, but incidentally only.

The *Augsburg Confession* presents as the purpose of Christ:

"that He might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." (3.)

"They are received into favour, and their sins forgiven for Christ's sake, who by His death hath satisfied for our sins." (4.)

So Zwingli's *Sixty-seven Articles:*

"Christ . . . has redeemed us from death, and reconciled us with God, by His innocence." (2.) "Christ . . . offered Himself once for all and is the eternal sacrifice, affording satisfaction for the sins of all believers." (18.)

The *First Helvetic* confesses that Jesus is the only Mediator, Intercessor, Sacrifice, High Priest, Lord, and King, our reconciliation, redemption, sanctification, expiation, wisdom, and protection. (11.)

The *French Confession:*

"We believe that by the perfect sacrifice that the Lord Jesus offered on the cross, we are reconciled to God, and justified before Him." (17.)

The *Articles of Religion:*

"He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by the sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world." (15.)

The Roman Catholic doctrine is given by the *Council of Trent:*

"If any one asserts, that this sin of Adam . . . is taken away either by the powers of human nature, or by any other remedy than the merit of the *one mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath reconciled us to God in His own blood, being made unto us justice, sanctification and redemption,*" etc. (Sess. 5^3.)

"Him God hath *proposed* as a propitiation *through faith in His blood, for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for those of the whole world.*" (6^2.)

The meritorious cause of justification is "our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, *for the exceeding charity wherewith He loved us,*

merited Justification for us by His most holy passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction for us unto God the Father." (6[7].)

"He, therefore, our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself once on the altar of the cross unto God the Father, *by means of His death,* there to operate *an eternal redemption,*" etc. (22[1].)

There can be no doubt that Rome and Protestants agree in all these essential points. Details of disagreement belong to theological controversies which will appear later on.

§ 15. *The Roman Catholics and Protestants also agreed as to the essential constitution of the Church as the one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church of the ancient Creeds, and as to the mediæval emphasis upon the Church as Christ's body and bride, and that Christ as the head of His Church imparted to it His authority and diffused His grace through all her institutions.*

Thus Zwingli in his *Sixty-seven Articles* maintained that Christ is the head of His body, the Church, and all Christians are members of His body, and that the Catholic Church is the communion of saints, the bride of Christ. (Art. 7, 8.)

The *Belgic Confession:*

"We believe and profess one catholic or universal Church, which is a holy congregation and assembly of true Christian believers, expecting all their salvation in Jesus Christ, being washed by His blood, sanctified and sealed by the Holy Ghost. This Church hath been from the beginning of the world, and will be to the end thereof, which is evident from this, that Christ is an eternal king," etc. (27.)

"As for the ministers of God's Word, they have equally the same power and authority wheresoever they are, as they are all ministers of Christ, the only universal Bishop, and the only Head of the Church." (31.)

§ 16. *The most important difference was as to the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. There was agreement as to the presence but difference as to the mode, whether transubstantial, consubstantial, dynamic, or memorial.*

These differences involved later discussions as to the nature of the glorified body of our Lord and of the communication of properties of the divine nature to the human, differences which do not appear in the Symbols of the Ref-

ormation period, but first in the *Formula of Concord* and the *Saxon Visitation Articles*. The Eucharistic differences have already been considered in the chapter on *The Sacraments*.*

§ 17. *The second Christological difference was as to whether the headship of Christ over the Church excludes the headship of the Pope.*

The Pope may assume prerogatives that belong exclusively to Christ, but this is not involved in the papacy as defined by the Roman Catholic Symbols.

The Pope is the head of the Church as the vice-regent of Christ. If the Church on earth is to have a head, it is difficult to see why an executive head should intrude on Christ's prerogative any more than a legislative head like an ecumenical Council, or why a pope as the head of the whole Church should interfere with the crown rights of Christ any more than a primate of a national Church, a bishop of a diocese, or a pastor of a local church, except in the extent and to the degree in which he may do it. So an ecumenical Council has a more extensive jurisdiction than a provincial Synod or a Presbytery; but any one of them acting as of divine right may intrude upon Christ's prerogative just as truly as any other.

All earthly jurisdictions should be on their guard in claiming the *jus divinum;* and there is a peril in exaggerating their authority. History shows that Protestant Church government has no more escaped that danger than the Papal.

The difference here is not in doctrine; but it is a question of fact asserted by Protestants when they claim that the Pope is antichrist, but denied by Roman Catholics, who assert that the Pope is the vicar of Christ.

§ 18. *The third difference is as to whether the one eternal priesthood of Christ is opposed to the priestly hierarchy in the Church of Rome.*

* *V.* pp. 281 *seq.*

Thus Zwingli asserts that those who give themselves out to be the chief priests are adversaries to the honour and power of Christ, and reject Him. (17.)

Rome, on the other hand, maintains that the priesthood in the Church is the priesthood instituted and directed by the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, Christ Himself; and that the hierarchy is only in several stages of jurisdiction above the priest, and, in fact, is not higher in priesthood than the simplest priest.

The Protestants recognise a priesthood in the ministry in some sense. The difference really is as to the nature of priesthood, and not as to Christ's high-priesthood or the relation of the earthly priesthood to the heavenly.

§ 19. *The fourth difference is as to whether the sacrifice of the mass is opposed to the one eternal sacrifice of Jesus Christ.*

Zwingli denies that the mass is a sacrifice. He says on the basis of the statement as to Christ's sacrifice:

"From this it is gathered that the mass is not a sacrifice, but the commemoration of the sacrifice once offered on the cross, and as it were a seal of the redemption effected by Christ." (18.)

The *Council of Trent*, on the other hand, refuses such a thing. The sacrifice of the mass is a representation of the sacrifice once offered on the cross. The elements offered on earth have their only validity by their union with the one sacrifice of the flesh and blood of Christ in heaven. The mass, what is it but the real body and blood of Christ? nothing else, according to Roman Catholic doctrine. Therefore there can be no such interference as Protestants urge. On the other hand, it is claimed that the sacrifice of the mass compels attention to the one sacrifice of Christ as the great central fact of the Christian religion; whereas in Protestant worship it is entirely dependent on the minister whether the people are called to consider the sacrifice of Christ or not. When the atonement was emphasised in preaching the sacrifice of Christ was sufficiently before the minds of the

people. But in these days, when the atonement is no longer so prominent in Theology, it is to be feared that the one sacrifice is not sufficiently before the minds of the people in the Protestant world.

§ 20. *The fifth difference is as to whether the mediatorship of Christ and His heavenly intercession exclude the intercession and mediation of saints.*

Thus the *Theses of Bern:*

"As Christ alone died for us, so is He to be prayed to as the only mediator and intercessor between God the Father and us believers. Therefore, the proposal to pray to other mediators and intercessors, existing outside of this life, fights against the foundation of the Word of God." (6.)

Undoubtedly, the invocation of saints, and reliance upon their mediation and intercession may and does interfere with reliance upon Christ, the one mediator and intercessor; but not necessarily so. The intercession of the Church and of pious people is urged in the Protestant Churches. Why, it may be asked, should this intercession and mediation cease when they depart into the other world into closer communion with Christ?

The basis of the Protestant opposition is not Christological so much as eschatological; opposition to the doctrine of Purgatory and neglect of the Middle State between death and the resurrection.

§ 21. *The sixth difference is as to the merits of Christ: do they exclude the merit of good works?*

The Roman Catholic Church in the *Council of Trent* asserts no less strongly than the Protestant Confessions that justification and sanctification are due to the merits of Jesus Christ alone; and they claim that the merit of good works has nothing whatever to do with the question. Undoubtedly, if men rely on good works for their salvation they intrude on the merits of Christ. But the Roman Catholics

renounce this as truly as the Protestants. The question is not a Christological one at all, but an ethical and practical one, as to the relation of the Christian to the Law of God, as to the question of works of supererogation, and as to the relation of works to faith and sanctification, upon which Protestants themselves disagree no less than they do with the Roman Catholics.

CHAPTER V

THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND ITS OPPONENTS

We have already given in Chapter V of *Particular Symbolics* an account of the origin and history of the Formula of Concord. We have now to consider its definitions and statements in their relation to the controversies of the time.

§ 1. *Original sin is defined as a moral and not a physical defect, adhering to and corrupting human nature, not to be removed till the Resurrection. Manichæism is rejected in its original form and in its more refined form of Flacianism. On the other hand, not only are Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism repudiated, but also the milder Augustinianism of the Catholic Church and the immediate imputation of Adam's sin of the Reformed Scholastics.*

Matthaias Flacius Illyricus, a pupil of Luther, building on some unguarded statements of Luther, that original sin was "a sin of nature, personal and essential," revived the Manichæan dualism, although in a more refined form, teaching that *Original Sin* was of "the very substance or essence of the natural man, who after the Fall ceased to be in any sense the image of God, and became the very image of Satan."* He distinguishes, however, between the physical and moral nature, and makes only the moral nature essentially sinful.†

Flacius' views came into the field of conflict in 1560, at a

* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I, pp. 269 *seq.*

† This view has been revived in recent times by the Plymouth Brethren in England, who so emphasise the distinction of the inward and outward man of Rom. 7^{18-24} as to make two distinct natures in the regenerate man: the old, irredeemable; and the new, created in regeneration and alone capable of salvation.

colloquy at Weimar, and continued to trouble the Lutheran Churches till long after his death (1575).

As we have already seen, Luther was an extreme Augustinian in the matter of sin as well as of grace, and he led Lutherans into grosser views of original sin than the Catholic Church had ever sanctioned. The *Formula of Concord* tries to be faithful to Luther and yet to reject the extravagances of Flacius. The Article first gives a statement of the alternatives, then affirms the right alternative and rejects the wrong. As to the simple alternative, there can be no question that the *Formula of Concord* decides in accordance with the New Testament and the historic Faith of the Church when it says:

> "The nature itself is one thing, and Original Sin another thing, which adheres in the corrupt nature, and also corrupts the nature." (Art. I, *Statement.*)

But it goes into such details in the rejection of supposed errors that it comes into conflict not only with Manichæism and Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, but with other opinions of ancient, mediæval, and modern times. Thus it rejects: (1) *immediate imputation* of Adam's sin to his posterity, the doctrine of the scholastics of the Reformed Churches, and still maintained by the Princeton school of theology; (2) the doctrine that *depraved concupiscences are not sin,* which conflicts with the Council of Trent. (3) It then rejects *Pelagianism,* which asserted "that the nature of man after the Fall is incorrupt." It also rejects various forms of *Semi-Pelagianism,* as (4) that original sin is like a *birthmark,* not impairing man's spiritual powers; (5) that it is a *stain* which may be easily removed; (6) the *milder Augustinianism of the Catholic Church* that "man's nature and essence are not utterly corrupt, but that there is something of good still remaining in man even in spiritual things"; (7) *Manichæism;* that "Original Sin is, as it were, something essential and substantial"; then (8) *Flacianism;* "that Original Sin is properly and without distinction the very sub-

stance, nature and essence of fallen man; so that between his corrupt nature after the Fall considered in itself, and Original Sin, there is no difference at all."

It also asserts the extreme doctrine that original sin cannot be removed until the Resurrection, which is against the Catholic doctrine that it is removed by regeneration in baptism.

It is evident that the *Formula of Concord* does much more than reject the new Manichæism of Flacius; it rejects the milder Augustinianism of the Catholic Church and of many Protestant divines, and sows the seeds of numberless controversies which continue until the present day. There are few theologians in Germany, or elsewhere, who can accept all of its statements on this subject.

Furthermore, the difficulties of the doctrine of Original Sin are not really faced. No adequate solution of the difficult problem is given. It rules out from orthodoxy the greater part of the Christian world at the time this article was written; also almost the entire Christian world before the Reformation, and all but a very small minority of Protestants, and even of German Lutherans at the present time. We shall meet the same problems in better form later in the controversies in the Reformed and Anglican Churches.

§ 2. *The Formula of Concord asserts the entire bondage of the will to sin before regeneration. It rejects the Melanchthonian synergism, which recognises that unregenerate man has still a slight remnant of freedom of the will, which he may use in co-operating with the grace of God. It also rejects the Catholic doctrine that the regenerate may in this life fulfil the Law of God and gain the merit of his righteousness.*

Luther asserted in the baldest form the bondage of the human will and waged a fierce war with Erasmus on this subject. Erasmus maintained the common doctrine of the Catholic Church before the Reformation.*

Melanchthon was undoubtedly influenced by Erasmus as

* *V.* pp. 127 *seq.*

well as by his general humanistic and milder tendencies. The controversy was opened by Pfeffinger (Professor in Leipzig), in 1550, who maintained the freedom of the will; not much freedom indeed, but a limited freedom; as Pfeffinger says: "the contribution of a penny toward the discharge of a very large debt."

The radical Lutherans appealed to the teaching of Luther and maintained the entire bondage of the will. The *Formula of Concord* states the case with reference to fallen and unregenerate man thus:

"Whether by his own proper powers, before he has been regenerated by the Spirit of God, he can apply and prepare himself unto the grace of God; and whether he can receive and apprehend the divine grace (which is offered to him through the Holy Ghost in the Word and sacraments divinely instituted), or not."

The *Formula of Concord* asserts the negative.

We cannot notice all the opinions rejected, but only the most important:

(1) It repudiates *Pelagianism*, which asserts "that man by his own powers, without the grace of the Holy Spirit, has ability to convert himself to God."

(2) *Semi-Pelagianism*, which teaches "that man by his own powers can commence his conversion, but cannot fully accomplish it without the grace of the Holy Spirit."

(3) The common Catholic doctrine before the Reformation, stated in the Council of Trent, and put in the modified form of the Philippists:

"If the Holy Spirit, by the preaching of the Word, shall have made a beginning, and offered His grace in the Word to man, that then man, by his own proper and natural powers, can, as it were, give some assistance and co-operation, though it be but slight, infirm, and languid, towards his conversion, and can apply and prepare himself unto grace, apprehend it, embrace it, and believe the Gospel."

(4) Also the common Catholic doctrine that "man after regeneration can perfectly observe and fulfil the Law of

God, and that this fulfilling is our righteousness before God, whereby we merit eternal life."

In the justification of Luther it is maintained that man may resist in unwillingness the divine Spirit, but that he is *purely passive* in conversion, and that the only two efficient causes in conversion are the Holy Spirit and the Word of God, which is the instrument of the Holy Spirit whereby He effects the conversion of man.

This, as Schaff says,* is against Melanchthon, who "taught that there are three causes of conversion closely combined; namely, the Holy Spirit (the *creative* cause), the Word of God (the *instrumental* cause), and the *consenting* will of man."

It is evident that the modern Lutherans would for the most part follow Melanchthon in this doctrine rather than Luther and the *Formula of Concord.* We shall meet the same question more thoroughly considered in the Reformed Churches. But it is evident that the *Formula of Concord* gave no irenic settlement of these problems, but only an authoritative decision in favour of a party in the Lutheran Churches.

§ 3. *The Formula of Concord asserts the imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification, both of His active and passive obedience, and according to both natures, the human and the divine, over against partial views of Christ's righteousness; and it rejects the infusion of Christ's righteousness as taught by Osiander.*

Luther asserted *justification by faith only,* an immediate act of God, faith being the instrument by which man receives it. Andreas Osiander was one of the Reformers of Nuremberg (1522), afterward Professor at Königsberg (1549). He objected to the forensic doctrine of justification, and taught that it was by an act of *infusion.* The righteousness of Christ was infused by regeneration, and it thus became our righteousness. He still regarded justification as immediate and as an act of God, and so differed

* *Creeds of Christendom,* III, p. 113.

from the Roman Catholic doctrine of a gradual justification by gradual infusion of grace. He also held that the incarnation of Christ and the regeneration of man were not due to the Fall and Original Sin, because in any case man must receive the righteousness of Christ in order to be a partaker of the essential righteousness of God. He thus raised many profound problems, the most of which were ignored by the *Formula of Concord.* The question considered was as to whether the righteousness of Christ becomes ours by *imputation* or by *infusion.* Osiander's views were opposed by Francesco Stancaro, an Italian, who also became Professor in Königsberg. He asserted that Christ was our Mediator according to His *human nature* only, reviving an opinion proposed by Peter Lombard. Karg, in Bavaria, opposed the doctrine of imputation, and limited the redemptive work of Christ to His passive obedience in His *passion,* and regarded justification as essentially *forgiveness of sins.*

The *Formula of Concord* affirms:

(1) That we are justified by faith only, and (2) that Christ alone is our righteousness, (3) according to both natures, the human and the divine, (4) by His absolute obedience as well as by His sufferings for sin; and (5) that His righteousness is imputed and not infused.

The following are some of the errors rejected:

(1) "That Christ is our righteousness only according to His divine nature."

(2) "That Christ is our righteousness only according to His human nature."

(3) "That we through love infused by the Holy Ghost, through the virtues and through the works which flow forth from charity, become in very deed righteous before God" (the Roman Catholic doctrine).

(4) "That believers in Christ are righteous and saved before God both through the imputed righteousness of Christ and through the new obedience which is begun in them."

The distinction between the active and the passive obedience of Christ, and between the human and the divine natures in the matter of the righteousness of Christ and our

appropriation of it, is rightly rejected by the *Formula of Concord*. But many modern scholars do not favour the *sola-fidean* position of the *Formula of Concord*, or the external and merely *forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness*, which seems to them not reality but fiction. It does not make the regenerate really righteous, but only *putatively* so; that is, it regards and treats them as if they were very different from what they really are.

The views of Osiander have been more clearly stated and more strongly enforced by the Quakers, or Friends, who originated out of the Church of England in the seventeenth century. These insist upon the *Christ within us* as the ground of our justification, rather than the Christ without us. And that opinion is more in accordance with modern thought, as it gives us possession of a real righteousness within us, which, though Christ's, is ours because Christ is really ours. This does not solve the problem; for the problem of justification depends upon the solution of the problem of sanctification and of the relation of Christ's righteousness to the personal righteousness of the believer as acquired by the process of sanctification. Here again the *Formula of Concord* does not solve the difficulties of the sixteenth century, but raises new ones. This question also was more fully discussed and better solutions reached at later times in the British Churches.

§ 4. *The Formula of Concord asserts, over against the Roman Catholics, that good works are voluntary and not obligatory to the Christian; that they are wholly to be excluded from any necessity or merit as regards our eternal salvation, as well as our justification. It also rejects the Reformed doctrine of the eternal perseverance of the saints.*

Luther, in his zeal for *faith only* and contention against *human merit*, threw love into the background and seemed to make good works unimportant as regards salvation. Melanchthon was a better theologian. He taught the necessity of good works as the fruits of faith, but not as a preliminary condition of salvation, which is a gift of God, not due to

human merit. The pupils of Luther and Melanchthon came into conflict on this question. Major, Professor at Wittenberg, declared in 1552 that *good works are necessary to salvation,* making the often-neglected distinction between justification and sanctification. This was bitterly contradicted by Amsdorf, who asserted, in 1559, that *good works are dangerous to salvation.* A synod held at Eisenach in 1556 decided that Major's proposition was true only *in abstracto* and *in foro legis,* but not *in foro evangelii;* and that it should be avoided as liable to be misunderstood in a popish sense. Christ delivered us from the curse of the law, and faith alone is necessary both for justification and salvation, which are identical.*

The *Formula of Concord* analyses this question into two: (1) whether "good works are necessary to salvation" or "detrimental to salvation"; (2) whether "the new obedience flows from a *voluntary* spirit" or "is not left to our mere will, and, therefore, is not free, but that regenerate men are bound to render such service."

(1 and 2) The *Formula of Concord* rejects the statements of both Major and Amsdorf, and takes an intermediate position, which is not altogether consistent. It asserts that good works are the sure fruits of a true faith, that the "regenerated and renewed are debtors to do good works," but that they render obedience "not of constraint or compulsion of the Law, but of a free and spontaneous spirit." It maintains that "good works are wholly to be excluded, not only when the righteousness of faith is treated of, but also when the matter of our eternal salvation is discussed."

(3) It rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of the merit of good works, even in the regenerate man, and also (4) the Calvinistic doctrine of the eternal perseverance of the saints, and maintains, as regards the latter, that faith and grace may be lost after regeneration.

Here again the *Formula of Concord* stands as near Luther as possible, and comes into conflict with Roman Catholics,

* *V.* Schaff, *Creeds,* I, p. 276.

Reformed, and the Philippists as well, and really takes an unethical position, which was in later times repudiated by most Lutherans. The identification of justification with salvation was a mischievous position, which made it impracticable to unfold the doctrine of sanctification and kept Lutheran theology for ever battling over the technicalities of the initial step in human salvation. The Reformed and Anglican Churches take better positions here, as we shall see later on.

§ 5. *The Formula of Concord sharply distinguishes between the Law and the Gospel, the former being anything in the Bible which convicts of sin, the latter the good tidings of salvation. The proper uses of the Law are:* (1) *an external discipline,* (2) *to bring men to a knowledge of their sins,* (3) *as a rule of life. Antinomianism is rejected on the one hand, and legal obligation on the other.*

The battle over the use of the Law was really earlier than that over good works. We discuss it here in the order of the *Formula of Concord.* Agricola, one of the Saxon Reformers, in 1527 attacked Melanchthon for preaching the doctrine that the Law should be used to bring men to repentance, and urged that the Law had been superseded by the Gospel. Luther opposed Agricola here, and maintained that the Law produced the negative side of repentance, knowledge of sin and sorrow for it; but that the Gospel produced the positive side, the resolution to lead a better life. The *Formula of Concord* makes Law "whatever is found in the Holy Scriptures which convicts of sins,"* and therefore Law is in the New Testament as well as in the Old. The Gospel is thus defined: "That it behooves man to believe that Jesus Christ has expiated all his sins, and made satisfaction for them, and has obtained remission of sins, righteousness which avails before God, and eternal life, without the intervention of any merit of the sinner." This is a merely theoretic distinction between Law and Gospel, but upon it is based the doctrine

* Art. V:3.

as to the uses of the Law and the Gospel. The *Formula* accordingly makes this very remarkable statement:

"We reject, therefore, as a false and perilous dogma, the assertion that the Gospel is properly a preaching of repentance, rebuking, accusing, and condemning sins, and that it is not solely a preaching of the grace of God. For in this way the Gospel is transformed again into Law, the merit of Christ and the Holy Scriptures are obscured, a true and solid consolation is wrested away from godly souls, and the way is opened to the papal errors and superstitions."

The *Formula of Concord* gives three uses of the Law: (1) *external discipline;* (2) *to bring men to acknowledgment of their sins;* (3) *as a rule of life for the regenerate.* Controversy is as to the third, whether the regenerate are to be urged to the observance of it or not. The *Formula of Concord* takes the former alternative and repudiates the other as false and pernicious dogma.

Here, again, more difficulties are raised than solved by these definitions. The distinction between Law and Gospel, though based on Luther himself, is purely theoretical, difficult to carry out, and really impossible, as it involves an arbitrary assignment of the material throughout both the Old and the New Testaments, in accordance with Luther's distinction as to what Law and Gospel really are. Indeed, the greater portion of the Bible cannot with any degree of certainty be assigned either to the one or to the other. This distinction is not recognised by any other body of Christians but the Lutherans; and so they separated themselves from the whole Christian world, ancient and modern, on this question. We shall meet with this question in the Reformed Churches also, especially in the Wesleyan view that the Gospel is a new Law, the very antithesis of the Lutheran position.

§ 6. *The Formula of Concord asserts that the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present in the Eucharist, are distributed with the bread and wine, and are taken*

into the mouth by all who use the sacrament, whether worthy or unworthy. It rejects: (1) *the Roman Catholic transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the withholding of the cup from the laity, and the adoration of the elements;* (2) *the supposed Zwinglian theory that the bread and wine are only symbols, figures, similitudes, types, or memorial signs;* (3) *the supposed crypto-Calvinist view, that only the virtue, operation, and merit of the absent body of Christ are dispensed.*

The antithesis between Luther and Zwingli in the doctrine of the Eucharist was softened by the mediation of Melanchthon and Bucer, and at last by Calvin, whose views were essentially accepted by Melanchthon in the edition of the *Augsburg Confession* of 1540, called the *variata* as distinguished from the original of 1530, which was named the *invariata.**

The extreme Lutherans, however, could not be reconciled to the intermediate position of the Philippists.

Westphal of Hamburg in 1552 renewed the battle by an attack on Calvin, Peter Martyr, and also the Philippists, who were called *crypto-Calvinists.*

The *Formula of Concord* thus states the controversy:†

"It is asked whether in the Holy Supper the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are truly and substantially present, and are distributed with the bread and wine, and are taken with the mouth by all those who use this sacrament, be they worthy or unworthy," etc.

The *Formula of Concord* distinguishes two kinds of sacramentarians: (1) the "gross sacramentarians" who "profess . . . that in the Lord's Supper there is nothing more present than bread and wine, which alone are there distributed and received with the mouth";

(2) the "astute and crafty" ones who declare "that they too believe in a *true* presence of the *true,* substantial, and living body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, which presence and manducation, nevertheless, they say to be spiritual, such as takes place by faith."

The *Formula of Concord* asserts: (1) that "on account of *the sacramental union* the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ"; (2) that the cause of the presence is

* *V.* pp. 176 *seq.* † Art. VII.

not in any utterance of the minister (the words of consecration), but "*the omnipotent power* of our Lord Jesus Christ alone"; (3) that "the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth, nevertheless not Capernaitically [by biting, chewing, digesting], *but after a spiritual and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union*"; (4) "that not only true believers . . . but also the unworthy and unbelieving receive," the one for "consolation" and "life," the other for "judgment and condemnation."

They reassert Luther's position: that "Jesus Christ is true, essential, natural, perfect God and man in unity of person, inseparable and undivided"; that "the right hand of God is everywhere, and that Christ, in respect of His humanity, is truly and in very deed seated thereat"; that God "has in His power various modes in which He can be anywhere, and is not confined to that single one which philosophers are wont to call local or circumscribed."

The *Formula of Concord* rejects (1): (*a*) "papistical transubstantiation," (*b*) "the papistical sacrifice of the mass," (*c*) the sacrilege of withholding the cup from the laity, and (*d*) the adoration of the elements of bread and wine; (2) the theories "that the bread and wine are only symbols or tokens,". . . "figures, similitudes, and types," "signs instituted for a memorial," supposed to be the Zwinglian opinion; (3) the theory that "only the virtue, operation, and merit of the absent body of Christ are dispensed," supposed to be the usual Reformed opinion.

It firmly rejects every theory that *localises* the heavenly body of Christ in heaven, or asserts that this is an essential property of human nature that even the divine omnipotence cannot change. It finally leaves to "the just judgment of God all curious and blasphemous questions." The *Formula of Concord* is here presumptuous and inconsistent, as if the authors of the *Formula of Concord* could define the limits of inquiry as to the Eucharistic presence. They have themselves asserted the most difficult, delicate, and seemingly

impossible things, and then reject as blasphemies any more searching inquiries into the question.

Here, again, the *Formula of Concord* solves no problems; it rather narrows the lines of the Lutheran dogma so as to exclude Melanchthon and all the Philippists, and to drive multitudes of them either into the Reformed Churches, or back to Rome, or to secret, hypocritical conformity. This latter perpetuated itself in Lutheranism as a leaven, until at last the whole structure of the Lutheran dogma was overthrown. There are few scholars in Germany at present who could defend these statements of the *Formula of Concord.*

§ 7. *The Formula of Concord asserts that Christ always had the divine majesty in virtue of the personal union of the divine with the human nature; that, in His state of humiliation He divested Himself of it, and only made occasional use of it; but that after His resurrection He laid aside the form of a servant and made plenary use of the divine majesty; that the* communicatio idiomatum *was real, true, and in very fact and deed, and not merely nominal, verbal, or titular as the Reformed were supposed to teach; that Christ therefore, not only as God, but also as man, is omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent.*

Luther's doctrine of the person of Christ was based upon German mysticism, and is an unfolding of the scholastic doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum.*

It became especially connected with his doctrine of the Eucharist; but Dorner* shows that this Christology was held and taught by him before his Eucharistic doctrine was disclosed. The *communicatio idiomatum* involves the communication of divine attributes to the human nature of Christ by virtue of the personal union.

As Dr. Schaff says:

"The mediæval scholastics ascribed *omnipresence* only to the divine nature and the person of Christ, *unipresence* to His human nature in heaven, *multipresence* to His body in the sacrament"; the last "from the miracle of transubstantiation, and not from any inherent specific quality

* *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, II, ss. 568 *seq.*

of the body." Luther "adopted the scholastic distinction of three kinds of presence: 1 *Local*, or circumscriptive . . . 2 *Definitive* (local, without local inclusion or measurable quantity) . . . 3 *Repletive* (supernatural, divine omnipresence). He ascribed all these to Christ as man, so that in one and the same moment, when He instituted the Holy Communion, He was *circumscriptive* at the table, *definitive* in the bread and wine, and *repletive* in heaven."—(*Creeds of Christendom*, I, pp. 286 *seq.*)

Melanchthon was opposed to the doctrine of *ubiquity* and the *communicatio idiomatum*. The disagreement between Luther and Melanchthon did not involve conflict during Luther's lifetime. The conflict first arose in 1564 at a colloquy at Maulbronn between the Swabians and the Palatines. The strict Lutherans followed Luther but divided into two parties: the one led by Brenz of Würtemberg, who agreed more closely with Luther in maintaining an *omnipresence* of the body of Christ; the other headed by Chemnitz, the Saxon divine, who held to a *multipresence* depending altogether on *the will of Christ*. Brenz held that the human nature of Christ had, from its origin in the Virgin's womb, divine attributes by a deification of His human nature. These attributes were usually concealed during His earthly life, and only publicly revealed after His resurrection. Chemnitz held that the Logos may temporarily communicate a divine attribute to the human nature as a *donum superadditum*.*

The *Formula of Concord* endeavoured to reconcile the disputants to the Lutheran Churches by its definitions. Thus it says:

"The principal question of this controversy has been whether the divine and the human nature in the attributes of each are in mutual communication *really*, that is, truly and in very fact and deed, in the person of Christ, and how far that communication extends."

The most important section of the affirmative statement is the following:

"That majesty, in virtue of the personal union, Christ has always had, but in the state of His humiliation He divested Himself of it . . .

* Schaff, *l. c.*, pp. 290 *seq.*

Wherefore He did not always make use of that majesty, but as often as seemed good to Him, until after the resurrection, He fully and forever laid aside the form of a servant, but not the human nature, and was established in the plenary use, manifestation, and revelation of the divine majesty, and in this manner entered into His glory (Phil. 2^6 *seq.*). Therefore now not only as God, but also as man, He knows all things, can do all things, is present to all creatures, has under His feet and in His hand all things which are in heaven, in the earth and under the earth." (Article 8; Affirm. 11.)

(1) The ancient errors of the Nestorians, Eutychians, Arians, and Marcionites are rejected. (2) Then the *Formula of Concord* goes on to reject, on the one side, theories which make the personal union of the human and divine natures nothing more than "common names and common titles," "a certain mode of speaking," or "only a verbal *communicatio idiomatum*"; in other words, as having no reality. (3) On the other hand, it rejects gross views, as "that the human nature (of Christ) has been made equal to the divine in respect of its substance and essence or of the essential divine attributes," or that it "is locally spread out into all places of heaven and earth." It then rejects all opinions contrary to its own thesis: as (4) "that it is impossible for Christ, on account of the propriety of His human nature, to be in more places than one"; (5) that "according to the humanity He is not at all capable of omnipotence and other properties of the divine nature."

There can be little doubt that this discussion opened up important questions relating to the human nature of Christ and what it gained from personal union with the Deity, and that the later discussions between the Tübingen theologians and the Giessen school still further advanced the problem in their battle over the *Kenosis*, whether it was a simple *Kenosis*, as the men of Giessen maintained, or a *Krupsis*, as was asserted by the Swabians. Both agreed that the human nature was in full possession (κτῆσις) of the divine attributes from the moment of incarnation; the question was whether their use (χρῆσις) was altogether laid aside except in the working of miracles, or whether it was *secretly used* (κρύψις).

The extravagances of the discussion prepared the way for the modern Kenotic theories, which have passed from Germany all over the Protestant world as the chief modern problem of the Incarnation, still in debate and yet unsolved.

The real gain from the controversy is the distinction between the state of humiliation and the state of exaltation, which now took an important place in Christology, and has become the common property and consensus of the Church. This involved distinctions which make the humanity of Christ more real and the life of Christ on earth a real human growth. It also, for the first time, made full use of the Pauline doctrine of the *Kenosis*, which also gained a permanent place in Christology. The exaggerations of the *communicatio idiomatum* and of the *Kenosis* by Lutheran divines do not decrease the value of this consensus.

The Reformed theologians could not accept the Lutheran Christology and the Melanchthonians gradually passed over to the Reformed Churches. They adhered strictly to the Chalcedonian formula and avoided the *communicatio idiomatum* of the scholastics, and were accordingly unjustly accused of a tendency to Nestorianism.

The Lutheran theologians, on the other hand, because of their exaggeration of the *communicatio idiomatum*, are accused by the Reformed theologians of tendencies toward Monophysitism. In fact, the Reformed theologians were reactionary here from scholastic Christology to Chalcedon; the Lutherans advanced beyond scholastic Christology into dubious and perilous opinions, which have been almost universally abandoned.

The human nature of Christ, by virtue of the hypostatic union with the person of the Logos, must have been the subject of influence and power from the Logos which could only have enhanced the qualities of the human nature beyond that of ordinary human nature. How far this went is the problem. It is best approached from the theory of a *gradual incarnation*, in which the divine influenced the human and imparted itself to the human gradually, so far as the human

was made capable of the divine. The New Testament is certainly against the theory that the human nature was in possession of divine attributes from the beginning of the incarnation. And yet, on the other hand, the human nature of Christ from the beginning had certain negative and positive qualities that were unique, such as *sinless flesh, incorruptible flesh,* and *a life-giving spirit, a spirit of holiness;* and Jesus exercised, especially late in His ministry, powers which no merely human being could have used, in the walking on the sea, the transfiguration, the Christophanic appearances after the resurrection, the ascension to heaven, the Christophanies to Paul, Peter, and John after the resurrection, etc., and, most mysterious of all, in His Eucharistic presence.*

The positions of the *Formula of Concord* cannot be maintained, for they rest upon a very partial and inadequate consideration of the subject. They did not solve the difficult problems; they did not stay discussion; they gave a basis for renewed discussion. On this question, however, there seems to have been a general agreement as to the recognition of the right of difference which, while inconsistent with the official attitude of the *Formula of Concord* on other less important questions, was yet of wholesome influence upon the subsequent development of German theology.

§ 8. *The descent of Christ into Hades, between His death and resurrection, was not to suffer the penalty of human sin, but to triumph over Hades for us.*

The controversy was started by Æpinus of Hamburg in 1544. He claimed that Christ descended into Hades to suffer the pains of hell for the salvation of men. Luther, in 1524, incautiously explained Psalm 16[10] in a similar way, but elsewhere took a different position. Melanchthon held that the question was unimportant and to be avoided, but thought it most probable that Christ descended to Hades to conquer the devil, destroy his power, and to raise the dead.

The *Formula of Concord* states the question thus:

* *V.* Briggs, *Church Unity,* pp. 280 *seq.*

"It has also been disputed whether this article is to be referred to the passion, or to the glorious victory and triumph of Christ."

It decides for the latter, but advises that the discussion is unprofitable.

The question would not down, however. Later divines take a different view from either of the alternatives, and hold that the descent belongs rather to the state of humiliation than to that of exaltation, and that it was to preach the Gospel for the salvation of the dead.*

§ 9. *Public authority may ordain rites and ceremonies which are not contrary to the Word of God and do not involve questions of conscience. Such are* adiaphora, *and they should be observed in the interests of peace and charity. If, however, they should be imposed in times of persecution for the sake of conformity with Papists, such conformity offends the conscience, and they should be rejected.*

The battle-ground of the Reformation was largely rites and ceremonies, which had become a burden to conscience and to life. As to the most important of these, such as those essential to the celebration of the sacraments, the Churches of the Reformation had taken their position;† but there was a large number of rites and ceremonies, some connected with the sacraments, others with public worship and other religious uses, that were not of so great importance and with reference to which there was much difference of opinion. There was a practical difficulty in such cases; for these questions were not merely differences of opinion, but were also differences of practice, and in large measure of public practice, in which agreement was necessary for joint participation in them. With regard to rites and ceremonies, it was evident that there must be a distinction between those that were essential and those that were not essential; those which involved doctrine and morals and questions of conscience, and those which did not involve

* *V.* pp. 65 *seq.*

† *V.* pp. 274 *seq.*

questions of conscience and might be regarded as ἀδιάφορα, *res mediæ—intermediate things.* The *Augsburg Confession* recognised:

"that it is lawful for Bishops or pastors to make ordinances, whereby things may be done in order in the Church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, and think that they sin when they violate them, without the offense of others. . . . Such ordinances it behooveth the Churches to keep for charity and quietness' sake, so that one offend not another, that all things may be done in order, and without tumult in the Churches." (Pt. II, Art. 7.)

The Confession does not, however, make specifications except in the case "of the Lord's Day, of Easter, of Pentecost and like holidays and rites." It gives the principle by which the discrimination may be made. But it is not easy to apply the principle, and great differences unavoidably arose in its application. The *Interims* endeavoured to regulate this matter.

The *Augsburg Interim*, 1548, only yielded to the Protestants the marriage of priests and the administration of the cup to the laity.* The *Leipzig Interim*,† which Melanchthon and other Lutheran divines prepared for Electoral Saxony, saved Lutheran doctrine, but required conformity to the Roman ritual in confirmation, episcopal ordination, extreme unction, the greater part of the canon of the mass, and also fasts, processions, and the use of images. This was a compromise, and the best that could be accomplished at the time; but it divided the Lutherans more sharply than any other question, and was probably, after all, the radical question, which created such animosity that all other questions in dispute were infected with rancour and misunderstanding. The great majority of Lutherans were hostile to the *Interim* and Melanchthon over this question, and Melanchthon himself subsequently recognised that he had yielded too much in the interests of peace. In fact, the whole question as to rites and ceremonies was raised both in

* *V.* pp. 187 *seq.* † *V.* p. 190.

principle and in practice by this prolonged controversy, and it continued to rankle in the discussion between the strict Lutherans and the Philippists until the *Formula of Concord* determined the question.

The question is thus stated:

"Whether in time of persecution . . . with a safe conscience, certain ceremonies already abrogated, which are of themselves indifferent, and neither commanded nor forbidden by God, may, on the urgent demand of our adversaries, again be re-established in use, and whether we can in this way rightly conform with the Papists in ceremonies and *adiaphora* of this sort."

The *Formula of Concord* takes the negative as follows:

(1) "Ceremonies or ecclesiastical rites (such as in the Word of God are neither commanded nor forbidden, but have only been instituted for the sake of order and seemliness) are of themselves neither divine worship, nor even any part of divine worship."

(2) "It is permitted to the Church of God anywhere on earth, and at whatever time, agreeably to occasion, to change such ceremonies, in such manner as is judged most useful to the Church of God and most suited to her edification."

(3) "Account should be taken of the weak in faith, and forbearance shown towards them."

(4) "In times of persecution, when a clear and steadfast confession is required of us, we ought not to yield to the enemies of the Gospel in things indifferent. . . . For in such a state of things it is no longer a question of *adiaphora*, but of the restoration and maintenance of the truth of the Gospel and of Christian liberty."

(5) "One Church ought not to condemn another because it observes more or less of external ceremonies, which the Lord has not instituted, provided only there be consent between them in doctrine and all the articles thereof, and in the true use of the sacraments."

In this article the *Formula of Concord* made a wise determination, which has been acquiesced in by Lutherans ever since. This controversy, so early, and so fierce during the time it raged all over Germany, was thus worked out to irenic results for the Lutherans. The same controversy we shall meet in Great Britain, where, however, it was not so easily solved, and where it still continues to trouble the Church until the present day.

The principle is liberty in non-essentials. Essential are those things only that are prescribed by the divine Word. All ecclesiastical ordinances are within the sphere of liberty. This liberty is, however, restricted to national Churches. It is not given to local congregations or to individuals. It is not even given to the ecumenical Church. There is no authority over the national Church. Each national Church is independent in this regard, and the only agreement that is necessary is in doctrine and in the true use of the sacraments. There is no liberty for the local church or the individual conscience. The individual must submit to the authority of the sovereign or suffer punishment for violation of ecclesiastical Law just as truly as for violation of civil Law. It remained for Great Britain to fight the battle for congregational liberty and individual liberty of conscience.

§ 10. *The Formula of Concord distinguishes between the foreknowledge of God and predestination; the former extends to both evil and good, but is not causative; the latter extends only to the good and is the cause of their salvation. The provision, promise, and offer of salvation are universal. It rejects the common Calvinistic doctrines of reprobation and limited atonement.*

This controversy arose in the free city of Strasburg, where Calvinists and Lutherans came into conflict.

Luther and Calvin alike were high Augustinians; both maintained the bondage of original sin and divine predestination; only Luther emphasised the former, and Calvin more the latter. Melanchthon was milder as regards predestination as well as bondage to sin.

The rigid Lutherans maintained Luther's doctrine of the bondage of the will, and many of them were high predestinarians; but the majority of Lutherans gradually became hostile to the high predestinarians, whom they attacked as Calvinists. In this they followed Melanchthon rather than Luther. Melanchthon and Calvin disagreed, but never came

into conflict on this subject, which shows that Calvin did not make it the corner-stone of his system, as some think. The battle over predestination began with an attack on Calvin by Heshusius in 1560, who was answered by Beza. Soon after Marbach, a pastor of Strasburg, attacked Zanchius, pupil and successor of Peter Martyr as professor there, for his maintenance of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and the perseverance of the saints.

The *Formula of Concord* (Art. XI) distinguishes "between the foreknowledge and the predestination, or eternal election of God. . . . This foreknowledge of God extends both to good and evil men; but nevertheless it is not the cause of evil, nor is it the cause of sin." . . . "*But the foreknowledge of God disposes evil and sets bounds to it, how far it may proceed and how long endure, and directs it in such wise that, though it be of itself evil, it nevertheless turns to the salvation of the elect of God.*" (An admirable statement.) . . . "The predestination or eternal election of God extends only to the good and beloved children of God, and this is the cause of their salvation." "Christ calls all sinners to Him, and promises to give them rest." . . . His call is universal, the offer of salvation is universal, and the promises are to all.

"But as to the declaration (Mt. 22^{14}), 'Many are called, but few are chosen,' it is not to be so understood as if God were unwilling that all should be saved, but the cause of the damnation of the ungodly is that they either do not hear the Word of God at all, but contumaciously contemn it, stop their ears, and harden their hearts, and in this way foreclose to the Spirit of God His ordinary way, so that He cannot accomplish His work in them; or at least when they have heard the Word, make it of no account, and cast it away. Neither God nor His election, but their own wickedness, is to blame if they perish. (II Peter, 2^{1} *seq.*; Lk. $2^{49, 52}$; Heb. 12^{25} *seq.*)" (11.)

It rejects as error:

"That God is not willing that all men should be saved, but that some men are destined to destruction, not on account of their sins, but by the mere counsel, purpose and will of God, so that they cannot in any wise attain to salvation." (3.)

This decision did not really amount to much. It was not a question in which there was much interest among Lutherans except so far as they came into conflict with Calvinists, and even then it was subordinate to the doctrine of the sacraments. As the article says: "Touching this article there has not, indeed, arisen any public controversy among the divines of the Augsburg Confession."

§ 11. *The Formula of Concord finally describes and rejects, as intolerable and imperilling salvation, the heresies of Anabaptists, Schwenckfeldians, New Arians, and Antitrinitarians.*

The Anabaptists cannot be tolerated either in the Church or by the civil government, or in domestic and social life. The others hold errors which all the godly "ought to beware of and avoid, unless they wish to hazard their own eternal salvation."

The *Formula* herein rejects opinions advocated later by Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, and Socialists of every kind.

Thus the *Formula of Concord,* in its efforts to give peace to the Lutherans, only succeeded in part. It became a standard for the greater part of the Lutherans during the period of Scholastic Protestantism, until Pietism and Rationalism combined to overthrow it. It has now passed out of use, except among some minor Lutheran bodies in Germany and the United States.

CHAPTER VI

THE SYNOD OF DORT AND ARMINIANISM

In Chapter V of *Particular Symbolics* we have given a history of the origin of the Synod of Dort and its work. We have now to consider its decisions in their relation to Arminianism and other kindred doctrines.

§ 1. *The Synod of Dort composed the Canons of Dort, defining the five points of Scholastic Calvinism over against Arminianism:*

The five points of Scholastic Calvinism are:

(1) *Absolute predestination;* (2) *limited atonement;* (3) *human inability;* (4) *irresistible grace;* and (5) *perseverance of the saints.*

The antithesis of Scholastic Calvinism and Arminianism was in these five points, which had become burning questions in the course of the controversy.

§ 2. *Arminians hold to a divine predestination, conditioned upon a divine foreknowledge of man's faith and perseverance. The Synod of Dort asserts absolute predestination as an act of divine sovereignty, altogether unconditioned.*

The Remonstrants, in Article I, state:

"That God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ His Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake, and through Christ, *those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this His Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through this grace, even to the end;* and, on the other hand, to

leave *the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath,* and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the gospel in John III: 36: 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him,' and according to other passages of Scripture also."

Over against this, the Synod of Dort states:

"Election is the unchangeable purpose of God, whereby, before the foundation of the world, He hath, out of mere grace, according to the sovereign good pleasure of His own will, chosen, from the whole human race, which had fallen through their own fault, from their primitive state of rectitude, into sin and destruction, a certain number of persons to redemption in Christ, whom He from eternity appointed the Mediator and head of the elect, and the foundation of salvation."

"This elect number, though by nature neither better nor more deserving than others, but with them involved in one common misery, God hath decreed to give to Christ to be saved by Him, and effectually to call and draw them to His communion by His Word and Spirit; to bestow upon them true faith, justification, and sanctification; and having powerfully preserved them in the fellowship of His Son, finally to glorify them for the demonstration of His mercy, and for the praise of the riches of His glorious grace," etc. (1^{7}.)

"*This election was not founded upon foreseen faith, and the obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality or disposition in man, as the prerequisite, cause, or condition on which it depended; but men are chosen to faith and to the obedience of faith, holiness, etc.*" (1^{9}.)

"*The good pleasure of God is the sole cause of this gracious election; which doth not consist herein that God, foreseeing all possible qualities of human actions, elected certain of these as a condition of salvation, but that He was pleased out of the common mass of sinners to adopt some certain persons as a peculiar people to Himself.*" (1^{10}.)

"What peculiarly tends to illustrate and recommend to us the eternal and unmerited grace of election is the express testimony of sacred Scripture, that not all, but some only, are elected, while others *are passed by* in the eternal decree; whom God, out of His sovereign, most just, irreprehensible and unchangeable good pleasure, *hath decreed to leave* in the common misery into which they have willfully plunged themselves," etc. (1^{15}.)

The *Westminster Confession,* adopts the doctrine of Dort and uses, especially in the doctrine of reprobation, still stronger language.

"These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are *particularly and unchangeably designed;* and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished." (3[4].)

"The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He *extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth,* for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, *to pass by,* and *to ordain them* to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." (3[7].)

These statements were one of the chief reasons for the separation of the Cumberland Presbyterians and for the recent revision of the *Confession* by the American Presbyterian Church.

The fundamental fault here both of Scholastic Calvinists and of Arminians is the attempt to range the divine decrees in an order, whether chronological or logical. The divine decree is not separate and apart from omniscience, but inseparable from it. The decree is not the antecedent of the foreknowledge. The foreknowledge is not the antecedent of the decree. They are inseparable in the mind of God. The limitation of predestination by foreknowledge by the Arminians is therefore reprehensible.

The Scholastic Calvinists were also still more to blame for their maintenance of an absolute, arbitrary decree of particular election and particular reprobation, especially when the latter is as positive as the former.

It is quite true that the Synod of Dort limits the absoluteness of the decree by putting: *out of mere grace* before "*according to the sovereign good pleasure of His own will*"; but it is evident that they meant to limit the grace by the good pleasure more than the good pleasure by the grace; for it is stated that *the good pleasure of God is the sole cause of this gracious election.* (10.)

So the *Westminster Confession* makes the statement that: "God from all eternity did, by *the most wise and holy counsel* of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." (3[1].)

The ordination is, therefore, conditioned by the *divine*

wisdom and holiness, and is not "according to the good pleasure of His will" apart from the divine wisdom and holiness. How can foreknowledge be excluded from the divine wisdom? Foreknowledge may be excluded as a *ground and reason* of predestination; but it cannot be excluded from the decree itself, any more than any other kind of divine wisdom. Again, how can arbitrariness of mere sovereign will be reconciled with divine holiness? The decree of sovereignty is not independent or precedent of the divine holiness, but is inseparable from holiness; so that the decree must be a *holy* decree as well as a *wise* one. So, again, if the decree is "out of His mere *free grace and love*" (3[5]), it must be a decree conditioned by divine grace and love. Nothing in the decree can be inconsistent with the love of God.

The *Westminster Confession* also emphasises that the decree of God is for *the manifestation of His glory* (3[3]); therefore nothing in the decree can be inconsistent with the glory of God.

Thus, in the Scholastic Calvinism of the *Synod of Dort* and the *Westminster Confession*, the divine sovereignty is a sovereignty of *wisdom, holiness, grace, love, and glory;* and within these limitations it is not arbitrary and absolute. The fault of the statements is that the absoluteness and arbitrariness of the will of God are emphasised, and the attributes of God that condition the sovereignty and the will are retained only in the background of the thought, as if they were limited by the sovereign will rather than the will by them. The decree of God in predestination, therefore, is not the arbitrary decree of an absolute sovereign whose will cannot be resisted. It is the decree of a Sovereign who is in His being *all wise, all holy, all loving, and all glorious*. Such a God will elect and reprobate only in accordance with His wisdom, holiness, and love; and will elect as many as possible and reprobate as few as possible; and that reprobation will not be a *positive* act of ordination, as the Scholastic Calvinists represent, but a negative one, of passing by, as the milder Calvinism, like the milder Augustinian-

ism of the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches, has always held. This milder Calvinism has always prevailed in the Church of England and has persisted in many of the Reformed Churches, especially in Germany; although in others, especially at certain times, it has been compelled by scholastic intolerance to take refuge with the Arminian Churches, without, however, adopting the technical Arminian position as to the order of the divine decrees.

The debates in the Westminster Assembly show that the divines did not wish to be too rigid in this matter. Thus Mr. Whitakers said: "If you take the same decree in reference to time, they are all *simul* and *semel: in eterno* there is not *prius* and *posterius*." "Our conceptions are very various about the decrees." Reynolds said: "Let us not put in disputes and scholastic things into a Confession of Faith." Gillespie said: "This shows that in *ordine naturae* God ordaining man to glory goes before His ordaining to permit man to fall."*

Furthermore, the fact that the Westminster Confession is largely based on the Irish Articles and that the divines deliberately inserted the qualifying clauses *the most wise and holy* before *counsel of His own Will* (3^1), and *out of his mere free grace and love* (3^5) and *for the manifestation of His glory* (3^3), shows that they wished to soften and limit the supposed arbitrariness of the decree.

§ 3. *The Arminians assert that Christ died for all men, on condition of their repentance and faith. The Canons of Dort affirm that Christ died only for the elect.*

Article II of the Remonstrants is as follows:

"That, agreeably thereto, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, *died for all men and for every man, so that He has obtained for them all, by His death on the cross, redemption and the forgiveness of sins;* yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer, according to the word of the Gospel of John (3^{16})," etc.

* *Minutes*, pp. 150–1.

The Synod of Dort asserts the infinite worth and sufficiency of the Atonement:

"The death of the Son of God is the only and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sin; is of infinite worth and value, *abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.*" (2[3].)

It also asserts that the declaration and offer of salvation is universal:

"Moreover the promise of the gospel is, that whosoever believeth in Christ crucified shall not perish, but have everlasting life. This promise, together with the command to repent and believe, *ought to be declared and published to all nations, and to all persons promiscuously and without distinction,* to whom God out of His good pleasure sends the gospel." (2[5].)

But nevertheless salvation is limited to the elect:

"For this was the sovereign counsel and most gracious will and purpose of God the Father, that the quickening and saving efficacy of the most precious death of His Son should extend to all the elect, for bestowing *upon them alone* the gift of justifying faith, thereby to bring them infallibly to salvation: that is, it was the will of God, that Christ by the blood of the cross, whereby He confirmed the new covenant, should effectually redeem out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, *all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to Him by the Father,*" etc. (2[8].)

The *Westminster Confession* takes the same position:

"All those whom God hath predestined unto life, *and those only*, He is pleased, in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by His Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ," etc. (10[1].)

"*Others, not elected*, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore *can not be saved:* much less can men, not professing the Christian religion," etc. (10[4].)

It is agreed: (1) that only the elect are saved; there is no universal salvation of men; (2) that the provision of salva-

tion is sufficient for all; (3) that the public offer of salvation is made to all; (4) that only those who repent and believe in Christ, are actually saved.

The question is, whether the purpose or intent of Christ's death was particular, or universal. This question is a logical consequence of the previous one. If the election is independent of, or precedent to, the foreknowledge, then a limited atonement is necessarily involved. But if the foreknowledge is antecedent, or if it is not separable from the election, then there is no sufficient reason to think of a limited atonement. This question is reserved for fuller discussion in the controversy between the scholastic theologians and the French school of Saumur.

§ 4. *It was agreed that the divine grace is prevenient; but the Arminians held that it is resistible, and that human cooperation is necessary to salvation; whereas the Synod of Dort claimed that the divine grace is irresistible, and that man is altogether passive in regeneration.*

The Arminian position is thus stated:

"That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following and cooperative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements, that can be conceived, must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But as respects *the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many, that they have resisted the Holy Ghost;* Acts 7 and elsewhere in many places." (Art. 4.)

The *Synod of Dort,* in antithesis, gives the following:

"But when God accomplishes His good pleasure in the elect, or works in them true conversion, He not only causes the gospel to be externally preached to them, and powerfully illuminates their minds by His Holy Spirit, that they may rightly understand and discern the things of the Spirit of God, but by the efficacy of the same regenerating Spirit He pervades the inmost recesses of the man; He opens the closed and softens the hardened heart, and circumcises that which was uncircumcised;

infuses new qualities into the will, which, though heretofore dead, He quickens; from being evil, disobedient and refractory, He renders it good, obedient, and pliable; actuates and strengthens it, that, like a good tree, it may bring forth the fruits of good actions." (3–4[11].)

"*And this is the regeneration so highly celebrated in Scripture and denominated a new creation: a resurrection from the dead; a making alive, which God works in us without our aid. But this is nowise effected merely by the external preaching of the gospel, by moral suasion, or such a mode of operation that, after God has performed His part, it still remains in the power of man to be regenerated or not, to be converted or to continue unconverted; but it is evidently a supernatural work, most powerful, and at the same time most delightful, astonishing, mysterious, and ineffable; not inferior in efficacy to creation or the resurrection from the dead, as the Scripture inspired by the author of this work declares; so that all in whose hearts God works in this marvelous manner are certainly, infallibly, and effectually regenerated, and do actually believe.* Whereupon the will thus renewed is not only actuated and influenced by God, but, in consequence of this influence, becomes itself active. Wherefore, also, man is himself rightly said to believe and repent, by virtue of that grace received." (3–4[12].)

The Synod of Dort is milder and more diffusive and explanatory in this Article than in the others; but the doctrine is clear enough. The divine grace is supernatural; and regeneration is, like creation and resurrection, a divine act in which man has no share whatever. "After God has performed His part" it does not "remain in the power of man to be regenerated or not," "to be converted or to continue unconverted." The human will is "dead" and not free to act until the regeneration has taken place.

The Arminians agree with the Philippists and the Roman Catholics here, the Synod of Dort with the *Formula of Concord.*

The *Westminster Confession* takes the same position as the Synod of Dort, only more definitely:

"Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." (9[3].)

"When God converts a sinner, and translates him into the state of grace, He freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by His grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good; yet so as that, by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not perfectly, nor only, will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil." (9⁴.)

"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man; who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." (10².)

There are two questions here, as they are treated in two different chapters of the *Westminster Confession:* (1) human inability or bondage of the will; (2) irresistibility of the divine grace.

The first question we may discuss better in connection with the controversies raised by the School of Saumur. It is sufficient to state here that the Synod of Dort denies the freedom of the will altogether, not only prior to regeneration but in regeneration itself, and asserts the High Augustinianism of Luther and Calvin, which had never been accepted by the ancient and mediæval Church. As regards the latter, it also consistently carries out the extreme Augustinianism, and makes the divine grace irresistible and man simply passive. Faith, repentance, the ability of man to act in salvation, are all infused by the divine grace.

The Synod fixes the attention upon the momentary divine act of regeneration and leaves out of consideration the processes of grace that precede as well as follow. So far as the order of salvation that follows regeneration is concerned, the Synod would not deny the freedom of the will or the ability of man to co-operate with the divine grace. It denies human ability to co-operate with the divine act of regeneration. When God acts the man is purely passive. The irresistibility of the divine grace in the moment of regeneration can hardly be denied. But how about the processes of grace prior to regeneration? Of course, if there is no human freedom before regeneration, and no human ability, then we

must suppose that all the processes of grace prior to regeneration are also irresistible, that preparatory grace in all its stages is irresistible: but that is contrary to human experience and the statements of Holy Scripture; for it cannot be maintained that the divine grace is absent from the means of grace, or being present is inoperative until its efficacy is put forth in regeneration. How often is the gospel heard and its influence felt before regeneration takes place!

The Protestant theologians have always been troubled where exactly to put regeneration in the order of salvation. There can be no justification without faith; and, according to the Synod of Dort, no faith without regeneration; therefore logically regeneration should precede justification. But then the question arises: Can a man be regenerated before he is justified? Not according to the teaching of St. Paul and the reformers. If faith is *infused* in regeneration, as the Synod of Dort teaches, then human salvation is begun by infusion and not by a declaratory act of God in justification. If regeneration is an infusion, why so much polemic against the Roman Catholic view that justification is a process of infusion?

Protestants cannot maintain the position that a sinner is first regenerated by an irresistible act of God, which infuses faith into him, and only afterward has his sins forgiven and the righteousness of Christ imputed to him; for human salvation would then depend not upon the righteousness of Christ imputed to him, but solely and alone upon the divine election and effectual calling in regeneration. If, however, it should be said that in regeneration the righteousness of Christ is *infused* into him by the vital union with Christ thus initiated, then there is no place left for imputing to him in justification what he has already in regeneration.

How, then, is regeneration related to justification? The Roman Catholics hold that it is one step in the process of justification. But if justification is a momentary act of God, and regeneration also a momentary act, they must either coincide or differ in order. We have seen the grave difficulties

that present themselves if regeneration precedes justification; but if it follows, then we have justification without faith, and justification by faith is cut in two; justification and faith are separated by regeneration.

We seem to be shut up to regard regeneration and justification as coincident; but if so, then as regeneration is an infusion, so far as it is coincident with justification, justification is an infusion also.

But Osiander's view that justification was an infusion was rejected by the *Formula of Concord*, and the similar views of the Quakers have been rejected by the Reformed Churches. The *Westminster Confession* leaves out of view *regeneration* altogether and substitutes for it *effectual calling;* but does not thereby avoid the difficulty, for it is compelled to put *effectual calling* first in Chapter X, and *justification* afterward in Chapter XI. It says:

"Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous." (11¹.) But *effectual calling* has already saved them "out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by His almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by His grace." (10¹.)

For those already in a state of salvation by Jesus Christ, effectually drawn to Jesus Christ, with faith infused and other saving graces, what need is there of a subsequent justification? They are already united to Christ. Christ is their own by a faith infused. Why should they need pardon of sin and imputation of Christ's righteousness? There is an inconsistency here, which Protestantism, in none of its divines, has ever been able to overcome. Regeneration was pushed into the background by the scholastic divines and only revived again in the practical theology of the Pietists

and Methodists, who were for the most part Moderate Calvinists or Arminians in their Theology.

The chief difficulty here is due to the exaggeration of the bondage of the will and in the concentration of the mind upon salvation as an immediate act of God instead of upon the whole process of grace. Such a concentration merely puts regeneration, or effectual calling, into an irreconcilable relation to justification.

§ 5. *The Synod of Dort asserts that, notwithstanding falls of various degrees of enormity, the elect persevere in the divine grace to the End. The Arminians were unwilling to teach this.*

There is agreement: (1) that the elect may fall into very great, and indeed enormous, sins; (2) that it is not within their own strength to keep themselves from falling; (3) that it is owing to the grace of God that they are able to persevere in grace.

The difference is as to whether they may forfeit the divine grace altogether. The Remonstrant Arminians did not positively affirm this. They only went so far as to refuse to affirm its opposite:

"But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginnings of their life in Christ, of again returning to this present evil world, of turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scripture, *before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our minds.*" (Art. 5.)

On the other hand, the Synod of Dort positively affirms the final perseverance of the saints:

"But God, who is rich in mercy, according to His unchangeable purpose of election, does not wholly withdraw the Holy Spirit from His own people, even in their melancholy falls; nor suffer them to proceed so far as to lose the grace of adoption and forfeit the state of justification, or to commit the sin unto death; nor does He permit them to be totally deserted, and to plunge themselves into everlasting destruction." (5⁶.)

"For in the first place, in these falls He preserves in them the incor-

ruptible seed of regeneration from perishing or being totally lost; and again, by His Word and Spirit, He certainly and effectually renews them to repentance, to a sincere and godly sorrow for their sins, that they may seek and obtain remission in the blood of the Mediator, may again experience the favour of a reconciled God, through faith adore His mercies, and henceforward more diligently work out their own salvation with fear and trembling." (5[7].)

So the *Westminster Confession:*

"They whom God hath accepted in His Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved." (17[1].)

In all these articles the Arminians revert to the milder Augustinianism of the Roman Catholic and Pre-reformation Church; the Canons of Dort maintain the Higher Augustinianism and Scholastic Calvinism.

The Synod of Dort simply took the position already taken by the English, Scotch, and Irish Puritans, and was therefore welcomed by them. But the Anglicans gradually by antithesis took the Arminian position, which the most of them have maintained ever since. In the Churches of England the Puritans are still Calvinistic, the Anglicans Arminian.

The Canons of the Synod of Dort were officially indorsed by the Reformed Church of France in 1620 and 1623. The other Reformed Churches received them with respectful consideration, but did not adopt them. The only Church outside of Holland that now officially holds to them is the Reformed (Dutch) Church of America; although Scholastic Calvinists in Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches still adhere to them. The Baptists divided on this question into two denominations, so did the Methodists; the Arminians being stronger among the Methodists, the Scholastic Calvinists among the Baptists.

CHAPTER VII

OLD AND NEW SCHOOL CALVINISTS

In *Particular Symbolics* we have considered the rise of the so-called New School Calvinists in France and the attacks upon them by the Swiss scholastics. These latter assumed that they were the orthodox Calvinists and endeavoured by the *Helvetic Consensus* to exclude the theologians of Saumur from orthodoxy. We now have to consider the variations in doctrine between these two schools.

§ 1. *The Helvetic Consensus went still further than the Synod of Dort in rigidity of scholastic Calvinism, and rejected all the special doctrines of the French school of Saumur.*

This Formula has twenty-six Articles which maintain:

(1) The literal inspiration of the Bible and the integrity of the traditional Hebrew text, vowel points and all. (Art. 1–3.)

(2) The infralapsarian order: Creation, Fall, Election, and Reprobation. (Art. 4–6.)

(3) The Covenant of works before the Fall and the Covenant of Grace in Christ, over against the three Covenants of Amyraut, natural, legal, and evangelical. (Art. 7–9, 23–25.)

(4) Immediate imputation and also mediate through inherent depravity, the latter dependent on the former. (Art. 10–12.)

(5) Limited Atonement: Christ died only for the elect, in intention and internal call, as well as in fact. (Art. 13–20.)

(6) The denial of natural as well as moral ability. (Art. 21–22.)

(7) The forbidding of the teaching of doubtful and unauthorised doctrine and the insisting upon adherence to the Second Helvetic Confession and the Canons of Dort, which they interpreted in support of their own doctrine.

The difference between the School of Saumur and the scholastic Calvinists extended gradually throughout the Calvinistic world. In England this School was represented chiefly by Calamy and Baxter, and divided the English Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists. In America the theology of the School of Saumur first came into prominence through Jonathan Edwards and the New England theology. This brought on a conflict of theologians, especially in the Middle and Southern States, that divided Calvinists into the Old School, which adhered essentially to the Helvetic Consensus, and the New School, which differed from the Old in the direction of the School of Saumur, although not adopting their views altogether, but taking in many respects newer and better views of the questions in dispute.

The conflict continued, especially in the American Presbyterian Church, until the third quarter of the last century, as to immediate and mediate imputation, general and particular atonement, natural and moral inability—a conflict in which Charles Hodge was the chief representative of the Old School party. Then came the battle over verbal inspiration, and inerrancy, and Biblical criticism. The division of opinion still persists in the United States, although it is less pronounced. In all other parts of the world it has disappeared.

The Westminster Assembly of divines was divided on these questions. A large proportion of the British divines were moderate Calvinists in sympathy with the School of Saumur, but there were also theologians who sympathised with the Swiss School. The Westminster Confession, therefore, did not decide any of these mooted questions.

§ 2. *The Helvetic Consensus asserts that the sin of Adam is imputed to all his posterity immediately prior to their commission of actual sin. The New School theologians deny immediate imputation and recognise only mediate imputation through inherited depravity and its consequences.*

The Helvetic Consensus says:

"Sicut autem Deus foedus operum cum Adamo inivit non tantum pro ipso, sed etiam in ipso; ut capite et stirpe, cum toto genere humano, vi benedictionis naturae ex ipso nasciturae, et eandem integritatem, si quidem in ea perstitisset, haereditaturo: ita Adamus tristi prolapsu, non sibi duntaxat sed toti etiam humano generi, *ex sanguinibus et voluntate carnis* proventuro peccavit, ex bona in foedere promissa perdidit. Censemus igitur, peccatum Adami omnibus eius posteris, iudicio Dei arcano et iusto, imputari." (10.)

"Duplici igitur nomine post peccatum homo natura, indeque ab ortu suo, antequam ullum actuale peccatum in se admittat, irae ac maledictioni divinae obnoxius est; primum quidem ob παράπτωμα et inobedientiam, quam in Adami lumbis commisit: deinde ab consequentem in ipso conceptu haereditariam corruptionem insitam, qua tota eius natura depravata et spiritualiter mortua est, adeo quidem, ut recte peccatum originale statuatur duplex, imputatum videlicet, et haereditarium inhærens." (11.)

The Westminster Confession is much simpler:

Our first parents "being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation" (6^3).

There is here no assertion of either mediate or immediate imputation. The statement admits of both opinions, but rather favours the realism of the early reformers in the terms "the root of all mankind" and the "corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation."

§ 3. *The New School theologians recognise only moral inability in unregenerate man. The Helvetic Consensus asserts natural as well as moral inability.*

The Helvetic Consensus says:

"Moralis quidem ea impotentia dici possit, quatenus scilicet circa subiectum et obiectum morale versatur: Naturalis tamen esse simul et dici debet, quatenus homo φύσει, *natura*, adeoque nascendi lege, inde ab ortu est *filius irae*, illamque ita congenitam habet, ut eam haud aliter, quam per omnipotentem et vorticordiam Spiritus Sancti gratiam, excutere possit." (21.)

"Censemus igitur, minus caste, neque sine periculo loqui illos, qui impotentiam illam credendi *moralem* vocant, ac *naturalem* dici non sustinent, adduntque, hominem, quocunque in statu constituatur, posse credere si velit, et fidem, quacunque demum ratione, esse ἐκ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν; quam tamen Apostolus consignatissimis verbis *Dei donum* nuncupat." (22.)

The Westminster Confession says:

"Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." (9^3.)

This seems, in the denial of "all ability of will," to favour the assertion of both natural and moral inability; but it has never been so interpreted by New School divines, and it is improbable that those of them in the Westminster Assembly would have consented to this clause unless they could have interpreted it as not rejecting their views. In fact, they could agree to it, because they also taught that the moral inability of man was such that he had "lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation."

As Henry B. Smith says:

"Man has the natural ability to repent, while he is morally unable, and the two are consistent with each other. This is the New England statement, the position of Edwards. . . . Though the sinner has the natural ability (in the sense assigned) to repent and believe, yet on account of his depravity, for the exercise of that ability, he is dependent on divine grace. The whole simple truth is contained in what the Apostle Paul says, Rom. 7^{18}, taking his statement in a strict metaphysical sense: 'To will is present with me but (how) to perform (I find) is

not.' . . . He has the ability in will as the power of choice, to accept or reject the grace offered to him, to obey or disobey the calls,—has the efficiency, though not the sufficiency."—(*System of Christian Theology*, pp. 327 *seq.*)

§ 4. *The Helvetic Consensus asserts a limited atonement as to intention and offer as well as to election. New School Calvinists assert the universality of intention and offer, and make the only limitation in the divine election.*

Thus the Helvetic Consensus says:

"Hæc omnia cum ita se omnino habeant, haud sane probare possumus oppositam doctrinam illorum, qui statuunt, Christum propria intentione et consilio tum suo, tum Patris ipsum mittentis, mortuum esse pro omnibus et singulis, addita conditione impossibili, si videlicet credant." (16.)

The Westminster Confession does not distinguish between the intention of Christ's salvation and effectual grace, but simply asserts *effectual calling*, in which both parties were agreed. As to the offer, it says:

"Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved." (10^4).

This recognises the gospel call and common operation of the divine Spirit upon others than the elect, but says nothing whatever of the intention of salvation. There is nothing here to which a New School Calvinist need object. It does not enter into the question in dispute.

In fact, there was a great debate in the Westminster Assembly on this subject. The chief English divines were of the New School, such as Edmund Calamy, Stephen Marshall, Lazarus Seaman, Richard Vines. The following citations from the *Minutes of the Westminster Assembly** show it:

Calamy says: "Jesus Christ did not only die sufficiently for all, but God did intend, in giving of Christ, and Christ in

* Pp. 152 *seq.*

giving Himself did intend, to put all men in a state of salvation in case they do believe."

Seaman says: "All in the first Adam were made liable to damnation, so all liable to salvation in the second Adam."

Marshall says: "There can no *falsum subesse* to the offer of the gospel."

Calamy says again: "There is a double love: general and special. A general love to the reprobate, and the fruit of this, a general offer, and general grace, and general reformation."

Vines says: "Is not the Gospel a covenant, and is not that propounded to every creature?—This word denotes an intention in the gift and in the love. We could not live if there were not a general love of (God) to mankind."

Vines says again: "He that believes not shall be damned. This is so positively set down as that it implies not only to be a sin against a law, but a sin against a remedy."

A statement to which these divines agreed, made in view of such expressions of opinion, could not rule out these opinions.

If American divines had known of these Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, they could never have battled over these questions as they did. But unhappily the Minutes were lying unknown in the Williams Library, London, until a few years ago.

The Helvetic Consensus unfortunately became the Symbol of the Old School Calvinists of America, which they followed rather than the Westminster Confession. The *Institutions* of Francis Turrettin became their text-book, and the Westminster divines were ignored, and became altogether unknown. And so the American Calvinists were plunged into a century of unnecessary and unfruitful conflict, for which the Princeton divines have been chiefly responsible. In a recent publication Francis L. Patton goes so far as to name Francis Turrettin the "Thomas Aquinas of Protestantism."

Blondel, in 1655, said, at the Walloon Synod of Amsterdam, that there were three parties in the Synod of Dort: (1) The Supralapsarians, represented by Gomarus; (2) the

Infralapsarians, represented by the majority of the Synod; and (3) the milder Calvinists of the type of the professors of Saumur, represented by the Church of England, Carleton, the Bishop of Llandaff, Joseph Hall, Davenant, and Samuel Ward, the representatives of Bremen, Martinius and also Isselburg and Crocius; and that therefore the decrees of Dort could not be quoted against the theologians of Saumur.*

So the same three parties were represented at the Westminster Assembly. The majority were Infralapsarians; but Twisse represented the few Supralapsarians. The chief English divines were in thorough sympathy with the School of Saumur. Therefore the Westminster Confession cannot be quoted against the so-called New School of Theology.

§ 5. *The Helvetic Consensus asserted the verbal inspiration of the Bible and the integrity of the traditional text, vowel points and all. The French School insisted upon a text to be determined by a rejection of the Massoretic apparatus as not original, and by the critical study of MSS. and Versions.*

The Helvetic Consensus says:

"In specie autem Hebraicus Veteris Testamenti Codex, quem ex traditione Ecclesiae Iudaicae, cui olim *Oracula Dei commissa sunt*, accepimus hodieque retinemus, tum quoad *consonas*, tum quoad *vocalia*, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et tum *quoad res*, tum *quoad verba* θεόπνευστος, ut fidei et vitae nostrae, una cum Codice Novi Testamenti sit *Canon* unicus et illibatus, ad cuius normam, ceu Lydium lapidem, universae, quae extant, Versiones, sive orientales, sive occidentales exigendae, et, sicubi deflectunt, revocandae sunt." (2.)

The great Biblical scholars of the seventeenth century stood by the French theologians in this discussion and rejected the uncritical and unhistorical dogma of the Helvetic Consensus.†

* Blondel, D., *Actes authentiques des Églises Réformées*, 1655, pp. 11 *seq.*

† Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 222 *seq.*

The Westminster Confession ignores this dispute. Nothing is said in it of the inspiration of vowel points, the inerrancy of texts or of verbal inspiration, but only a general statement is made to which Cappellus and New School theologians could cordially agree.

"The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical." (1[8].)

In other respects the Westminster Confession simply adheres to the Symbols of the Reformation in its doctrine of the Bible, and its statements have been accepted as valid by modern Biblical scholars.

However, the errors of the Helvetic Consensus have continued to exert an unfortunate influence upon Old School theologians in Great Britain and America until recent times. They soon were obliged to abandon the inspiration of the Massoretic apparatus of the Old Testament; but they continued to insist upon the verbal inspiration of the Hebrew and Greek texts and to resist the correction of these texts by ancient MSS. and versions. W. H. Green, as president of the American Company of Revisers of the Old Testament, would not consent to the very moderate action of the British revisers in putting the readings of the ancient Versions in the margin of the Revised Version. And the American Revisers say in their appendix: "Omit from the margin all renderings from the LXX, Vulgate, and other ancient versions or authorities." *

Again when they were compelled to retreat from the infallibility of the traditional texts of the Bible, they took refuge in the novel theory of the "inerrancy of the original autographs."† The Princeton divines, A. A. Hodge, F. L.

* *V.* Briggs, *Revised Version of the Old Testament, in Presbyterian Review*, July, 1885, pp. 492 *seq.*

† Briggs, *General Introduction*, pp. 634 *seq.*

Patton, and B. B. Warfield, insisted upon this doctrine as essential; and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1893 indorsed their position, and so placed themselves athwart the Biblical scholarship of the world. But a large minority protested against this decision and refused to regard it as valid, and it is sufficiently evident that this decision cannot be enforced.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND THE CONFLICTS OF BRITISH CHRISTIANITY

The history of the conflicts leading up to the Westminster Assembly has been given in Chapter V of Particular Symbolics. We have now to consider the Westminster Confession itself, and the conflicts about its doctrinal statements.

§ 1. *The Westminster Confession enlarges the definitions of doctrine so as to give a complete system of theology. It is not, indeed, really complete; but it does, in fact, give important definitions in advance of any previous symbol.*

Chapter I, *Of the Holy Scripture*, is admirable; by far the best Symbolic statement; one which in no particular stands in the way of Biblical criticism. It does not follow the *Helvetic Consensus* in its insistence on verbal inspiration and the originality of the Hebrew vowel points. The opinion of some scholastic divines who, compelled to abandon the inerrancy of the Hebrew and Greek texts, urge the inerrancy of a supposed original text, finds no representation.

Chapter II, *Of God and of the Holy Trinity*, is entirely in accord with the Nicene Faith; only its feeble statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in Section 3 was altogether inadequate to resist the Unitarianism, which came in like a flood early in the eighteenth century and eventually captured the entire Presbyterian body in England.

Chapters III, *Of God's Eternal Decree;* IV, *Of Creation;* V, *Of Providence;* VI, *Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof;* VII, *Of God's Covenant with*

Man; IX, *Of Freewill;* X, *Of Effectual Calling,* all take the High Calvinistic position of the Synod of Dort over against Arminianism: and no kind of revision can change them into an admission either of Arminianism or of the moderate Augustinianism of the Roman Catholic Church, of the Lutheran Church, of the *Articles of Religion* of the Church of England, or of Modern Thought. They are excessive in their elaborate statements, and rigid and polemic in their doctrine.

Chapter VIII, on *Christ the Mediator,* is in accord with the Chalcedonian Formula and the Nicene Creed, in four sections, which are relatively inadequate to set forth the great central and fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion. Section 5 gives a very limited and altogether unsatisfactory statement of the doctrine of the *atonement,* which has given endless trouble to the Presbyterian Church until the present time. It follows the Scholastic Calvinists by emphasising the idea of *purchase* and *satisfaction,* and omitting everything else. It also unfortunately abandons the Anselmic view of the *divine Majesty* as offended and needing satisfaction, and limits the atonement to the satisfaction of the single attribute of *justice.* I reserve this for further consideration. In Section 6 it simply states what was the consensus of Christianity, that the Old Testament saints had a share in the salvation of Jesus Christ. Section 7 unfortunately follows the Reformed Scholastics in their antagonism to the Lutheran communication of attributes, and limits it to a merely *nominal one.* Section 8 is simply a reassertion of the limited atonement of the Synod of Dort.

Chapter XI, on *Justification,* is an admirable statement of the great doctrine of the Reformation, except so far as High Calvinism warps its statements and so puts it in conflict with the Chapter on *Effectual Calling* and confuses *the order of salvation.*

Chapters XII–XV, on *Adoption, Sanctification, Saving Faith, Repentance unto Life,* are new chapters in Symbolic Theology, and the choicest parts of the Confession and the

chief contribution of Puritan theology to the enrichment of the Christian Faith. Unfortunately these have been ignored by the theologians and the ministry, because they were apart from the theological conflicts between Arminianism and Calvinism, and between the Old and the New School Calvinism.

Chapter XVI, on *Good Works*, influenced by the previous chapters, is also, in the main, excellent, and its statements far superior to those of the *Formula of Concord*. But Sections 4 and 7 are unfortunate in their polemic against Roman Catholic doctrine; for they not only deny works of supererogation, or the ability of man in the liberty of love to do more than God requires, but even his ability to do all that God requires, and so antagonise the possibility of human perfection. Section 7, in its assertion that the good works of unregenerate men are sinful and cannot please God, offends the moral sense and was one of the chief grounds of a call for the revision of the Confession by many Presbyterians.

Chapter XVII, on the *Perseverance of the Saints*, simply adheres to the Synod of Dort.

Chapter XVIII, is another admirable chapter because it is an advance upon all previous Symbols in a normal, and not a polemic, direction. It distinguishes between *Faith* and the *Assurance of Faith*, and clearly explains the nature of each.

Chapter XIX on *the Law of God*, is also admirable, far in advance of the *Formula of Concord*, and not open to the criticism to which the statements of the latter are open.

Chapter XX, on *Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience*, is another Symbolic advance, making the discrimination that the battle for liberty of conscience had involved in British Christianity. This we shall consider in a subsequent section.

Chapters XXI–XXV take up questions of *Religious Institutions*, which, also, I reserve for the present.

Chapter XXVI, on the *Communion of Saints*, is also an admirable statement to which no valid exception can be taken.

Chapters XXVII and XXIX, on the *Sacraments*, are careful, thorough, and most excellent statements of the Calvinistic position, in entire accord with what the Churches of England and Scotland had maintained since the Reformation, and still maintain officially, however much individuals may have departed from them.

Chapter XXVIII, to which Baptists do not agree, we shall reserve for the present.

Chapters XXX–XXXI, on *Church Censures* and *Synods and Councils*, were rejected by the Parliament of England, and are refused by Congregationalists. These must be reserved for further consideration.

Chapters XXXII–XXXIII, on *the State of Man After Death, the Resurrection of the Dead*, and *the Last Judgment*, state the ordinary Protestant positions with great reserve. The most serious defect is the ignoring of the *Intermediate State* between death and the resurrection, owing to the common repugnance to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. The statement in XXXII : 1, that "besides (heaven and hell) these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none," is most certainly based on ignorance of Scripture, which does in fact in both Testaments teach that the place of departed spirits is שְׁאוֹל, or *Hades*, and that this place is distinct from *heaven* on the one hand, and from *Gehenna, Abaddon, the Pit* (various names for the ultimate place of punishment),* on the other. The Confession is altogether silent as to the condition of souls in that period, immense for most of them, between death and the resurrection. Thus inadequacy on the one hand, unscriptural and positive assertions on the other, have given occasion to serious controversy and differences in the Church ever since.

§ 2. *The Westminster Confession narrows the doctrine of the Atonement by putting the emphasis upon the expiatory character of Christ's sacrifice, once offered on the Cross, the satisfaction of divine justice and the purchase of reconciliation*

* *V.* Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith*, pp. 125 *seq.*

with God, thereby involving British Christianity in controversies which have endured till the present time.

We have seen that the doctrine of the Atonement first originated as a definite doctrine with Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo;* and that his doctrine in its essentials became the consensus of the Mediæval Church without any symbolic definition.* We have also seen that the symbols of the Reformation, both Protestant and Catholic, agreed in the essentials of the same doctrine, mentioning it, however, only incidentally in connection with the doctrine of justification; the Council of Trent also in its definition of the sacrifice of the Eucharist.† The Roman Catholic Church never felt the necessity of making any symbolic definition of this doctrine. The statements of Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic divines, have been regarded as sufficient, and a considerable amount of liberty of opinion has been recognised in the details of the doctrine.

So in the Anglican Articles of Religion the Atonement is only referred to incidentally and in simple terms which have never occasioned any controversy in the Church of England or her daughters.

Article II, *Of the Word or Son of God:* "Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

Article XV, *Of Christ alone without sin:* "Who, by the sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world."

Article XXXI, *Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross:* "The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

The Westminster Assembly revised Article XI on the *Justification of Man*, by the insertion of the following clause: "*His whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us, and Christ with His righteousness being apprehended, and rested on* (by faith) *only.*"

* *V.* pp. 137 *seq.*

† *V.* pp. 292, 330 *seq.*

It was a serious mistake of the Protestant scholastics that they were not content to maintain the attitude of the Reformers and the Mediæval Church in the doctrine of the Atonement, and especially of the Westminster divines that they were not content with the statements of the *Articles of Religion*, on this subject.

(1) They agreed with the emphasis upon the expiatory character of the sacrifice of Christ, which marked the late Middle Ages, to the neglect of other more important features of that sacrifice as taught in the Bible. They laid stress upon the immolation of the victim rather than upon the use of the flesh and blood, which latter certainly was the most significant thing in all the sacrifices of the Old Testament and of their New Testament fulfilment. The Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass was attached so closely to the sacrifice of Christ Himself that, while its expiatory character was emphasised, yet the neglect of the other important elements of the sacrifice was prevented by the nature of the Eucharist itself, in which the flesh and blood were both offered to God and partaken of by the offerer, and the continuous nature of the sacrifice, as attached to the eternal High Priest and Victim in heaven, was maintained. On the other hand, the Protestant scholastics, by their agreement with the Protestant Reformers in their rejection of the expiatory sacrificial character of the Eucharist and their neglect of other features of the sacrifices of the Bible as fulfilled in Christ, thought of the sacrifice of Christ as exclusively expiatory, and so attached it to the Cross as offered thereon once for all. Thus the sacrifice was reduced to expiation, and expiation limited to the death of the Cross. The doctrine of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, once made on Calvary, is orthodox doctrine so far as it goes; but it is only a part of a much greater whole, the neglect of which puts the doctrine into an awkward and questionable position, open to attack from many sides.

(2) The attachment of the doctrine of the Atonement to the doctrine of justification as a momentary forensic act of

God, urged to an exaggeration of the divine forensic justice in the atonement also; and thus the divine love and mercy were pushed into the background, or veiled by their special manifestations in the divine grace, which itself was usually limited by the divine sovereignty. The doctrine of Anselm contemplated the divine majesty, the divine honour, the throne of God itself as offended by human sin, rather than the divine justice as such in the court of the judge. In the divine majesty all the divine attributes were summed up and harmonised, and justice could not so well be exalted above mercy and love. The justice of the judge demands the execution of the penalty of the Law upon the transgressor. The judge has no discretion in the matter. All governments recognise the right of appeal from the judge to the sovereign, because all Law, even divine Law, as is evident from its development in the Old Testament, is from the nature of the case imperfect. It is given in general comprehensive terms, and it does not and cannot discriminate between all the immense variety of cases of infraction. The judge cannot take into consideration all mitigating circumstances and general interests apart from the particular case. The executive must have the last word to say; for his justice is not bound to the particular law, but is free to rise above statutes and customary Law to the source of all Law and the fundamental principles upon which it is based, which will determine cases beyond the scope and power of any given law. The sovereign may consider other interests in the case as well as the legal interest. The Protestant scholastics insisted on the justice of the judge in the doctrine of the Atonement, and would not recognise the liberty of justice of the sovereign; and so they commonly said: "God must be just; but He may at His discretion be merciful."

This distinction between justice and mercy is entirely contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the historic Theology of the Church, which emphasise the love rather than the justice of God. In fact, in the Bible justice is an attribute of the monarch rather than of the judge, and is

constantly associated with redemption in the vindication of God's people against their enemies, especially in the Psalter and the second Isaiah, and so in St. Paul.

The satisfaction of the divine Majesty is one thing, the satisfaction of the divine justice is another and much more limited thing; for the satisfaction of the divine Majesty requires the satisfaction of all the other attributes of God no less than His justice, and of the interests of His throne and kingdom as well. And so the Scholastics, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, both rightly hold that the method of salvation was entirely dependent upon the divine sovereign will. There was no absolute necessity in the Divine Being that His justice should be satisfied by the visitation of the penalty either upon the guilty man or his substitute, Jesus Christ the Saviour. The sovereign has in his very sovereignty the right to pardon or to punish in accordance with his wisdom and the best interest of his kingdom; and if he punishes, to determine the extent and degree of punishment. The Protestant scholastics in their exaggeration of punitive justice, and indeed of exact distributive justice, overlooked and neglected the more fundamental Biblical conception of the pardon and remission of sins to the repenting sinner, trusting in the forgiving love of God.

Shakespeare was more orthodox than the scholastic Protestant when he wrote:

> "And earthly power doth then show likest God's
> When mercy seasons justice."

Undoubtedly the justice of the executive as truly as the justice of the judge demands adequate satisfaction—that is the teaching of Holy Scripture; but the satisfaction of the court of justice is one thing, that of the sovereign another thing. Sinful man is

"justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth *to be* a propitiatory (or propitiation) through faith, in His blood, to shew His righteousness, because of the passing

over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the shewing of His righteousness at this present season: that He might Himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." (Rom. 3^{24-26}.)

The satisfaction that the divine justice required for sinners according to the Old Testament was satisfaction at the propitiatory כפרת of the altar by the application of the blood of the victim, there to cover over, כפר obliterate, expiate, חטא, the guilt, which stained the altar and obstructed union and communion with God there. It was not the death of the victim that expiated sin; it was the life-blood of the victim, which had cleansing and quickening power. The immolation of the victim was simply and alone to secure its flesh and the blood. So Jesus Christ became the propitiatory or mercy throne of the Christian dispensation, and His blood the propitiation on the altar throne. It was not Christ's death on the Cross that made the propitiation; it is His blood, ascending to the presence of the Father and remaining ever present there in Christ Himself, the Propitiator, that continually obliterates the guilt of human sin and makes the access of His people to the throne of God ever open.

The divine Majesty was offended by the sin of the first Adam and all his race. Their offence was obliterated, and satisfaction therefor rendered by the presence at His right hand of His only begotten and well-beloved Son, the second Adam, the Mediator of a new regenerate humanity, in vital union and ever-living communion with Him.

(3) It is undoubtedly true that sinful man is at enmity with God; and that God is and must be angry with the sinner, so far as he is and remains a sinner. There must be a reconciliation with God in order to salvation. But it is man who needs reconciliation rather than God. God's grace is ever prevenient, anticipatory, and provocative of any and every disposition for reconciliation on the part of man. The only thing that man can do is to thankfully acknowledge, receive, and yield himself to the power of the divine reconciling grace. As the apostle says:

"But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech (you) on behalf of Christ be ye reconciled to God. Him who knew no sin He made sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." (II Cor. 5^{18-21}.)

There is undoubtedly an imputation here both of sin and of righteousness; not, however, of a nominal or judicial kind, but of a real and sovereign kind, initiated by God the Father Himself. To Christ is imputed sin, though He knew no sin, because by His incarnation He was incorporated in the race of Adam, and, therefore, made liable to all the consequences of sin incurred by the race as such, the penalties of suffering, death on the cross, and descent into Hades. He was not a sinner personally, but by His own act He became identified with a sinful and offending race and assumed all the consequences of His Incarnation. On the other hand, to mankind is imputed the righteousness of Christ. Man has it not personally; but, because he has been united to Christ by regeneration and is in Christ a new creature (II Cor. 5^{17}), he shares in the righteousness of the second Adam, his spiritual progenitor, and in all the benefits of that righteousness. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8^{1}). "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" (Rom. 8^{33-35}). Justification is not and cannot be a matter of debit and credit.

Merit and demerit undoubtedly played too important a part in the later Middle Ages; and it was one of the most important results of the Reformation that it did away with the estimation, both Protestant and Catholic, of merit and demerit in terms of barter and sale. However, the fault re-

mained in the estimation of the Atonement among Protestant scholastics. The emphasis upon the momentary act of justification led the scholastic Protestants to think of the immediate imputation of human sin to Christ and of Christ's righteousness to man, a purely external, nominalistic, juridical estimation. Such a purchase of reconciliation with God on the part of Jesus has no Biblical support whatever. It is true the term imputation is used both in the Old Testament and the New; not, however, in a commercial sense, but in the sense of the estimation or non-estimation of guilt, entirely parallel with remembering or not remembering, an act of the mind of God rather than of His will, and ordinarily used in parallelism with forgiveness, as in Psalm 32.

"Happy the one whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered:
Happy the one unto whom Yahweh imputeth not iniquity."

There is no suggestion of sacrifice of any kind in this Psalm. It is the sovereign good pleasure of God to forgive, cover over, and not impute sin in its various forms.

The narrowing of the doctrine of the Atonement in the Westminster Confession, and the emphasis upon an external, juridical, nominalistic theory of it, brought on the controversies of the subsequent centuries. The governmental theory of Grotius was a reaction toward the mediæval doctrine by its substitution of rectoral for distributive justice, but it was still too much involved with legal conceptions. The moral-influence theories of modern times, in their reaction against juridical theories, went to the other extreme, and did away altogether with the sacrificial character of the Atonement. The doctrine of the Westminster Confession is orthodox so far as it goes. It is defective in that it neglects the depths and breadths of the Biblical doctrine, and narrows the mediæval Anselmic doctrine, to which the Roman Catholic Church still adheres. It would be enriched by recognising that the Atonement was not a momentary act attached to the cross, but a continuous work of Christ from His Incarnation to His Second Advent. It is necessary to

maintain the sovereign right of God to forgive sins, and not to regard or treat sinners as sinners when they repent and seek refuge in Him. We must hold that the Atonement was not merely an external act of Christ, by which He purchased sinners from the devil either as a person or as Sin and Penalty personified, but an act of Christ as the Incarnate One, the second Adam uniting mankind to Himself by regeneration in a kingdom of redemption, so that all the redeemed share with Him in all His redemptive acts.

His people are still more truly one with Him as the second Adam by supernatural birth than they were by natural birth with the first Adam. They are reconciled with God, not by external purchase, but by vital union and eternal communion with Christ their Advocate, Surrogate, Interposer, Intercessor, and Guarantor.

§ 3. *The Westminster Assembly divided the Protestants of Great Britain into three kinds of Church government: Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Independent or Congregational.*

The Church government established in Great Britain at the Reformation was episcopal, the bishops representing the crown, which had supreme authority in the Church and State. The government of the crown was limited in some respects by Parliament, that of the bishops by convocation. But Parliament could not seriously resist the determinations of the crown until the reign of Charles I, whose absolutism became intolerable and so brought on the civil wars of England. Just so the dominion of the bishops became intolerable, and Archbishop Laud of Canterbury brought the Churches of the four nations to rebellion.

The Church of Scotland differed from the Churches of England, Wales, and Ireland, in the relation of the bishops to the Church. The First Book of Discipline (1560) provided ten superintendents, or bishops, for the Church of Scotland; but they were subject to the General Assembly of the whole Church, in whch all notables, civil and ecclesiastical, were gathered.

The bishops, however, became subservient to the crown; and so in 1578 the General Assembly adopted the Second Book of Discipline, and in 1580 resolved to do away with bishops. A National Covenant was drawn up and signed in 1581 by the king of Scotland, the nobles, ministers, and people, and the Church was reconstructed on a thoroughly Presbyterian system: Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly, without bishops. In 1584 King James and his nobles restored episcopacy and the Presbyterian leaders were forced into exile. In 1585 they returned, and the General Assembly in 1586 consented to a modified episcopacy responsible to the General Assembly.

In England, Thomas Cartwright and William Travers advocated a Presbyterian polity. A Book of Discipline was prepared and adopted by a synod meeting in London without authority in 1584, and was revised, adopted, and subscribed to in 1590 by some five hundred ministers.*

Presbyterianism was secretly organised in England, but was so persistently persecuted by the bishops that the organisation could not be continued. In the meanwhile Robert Browne advocated a voluntary association by covenant of true believers living Christian lives, and that each congregation had exclusive right of choice of its own officers and discipline. He organised his first congregation at Norwich in 1580 or 1581. He subsequently submitted to the Church in 1585, and served as schoolmaster and pastor for forty years. Henry Barrow agreed essentially with Browne, although he put the government of the congregation in the hands of elders rather than of the congregation. His principal work was written in 1589.†

The views of these early Congregationalists were somewhat modified by later leaders, who sought refuge in Holland from persecution by the bishops.

In 1592 the bishops were again overthrown in Scotland;

* It is given in Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, *Appendix*, pp. ii–xvii.

† *A True Description out of the Word of God of the Visible Church*; *v.* H. M. Dexter, *Congregationalism*, 1880, pp. 61 *seq.*

but after James of Scotland became king of England, in 1603, he determined to restore episcopacy on the theory, "No bishop, no king"; the bishops were restored in Scotland, and absolutism in Church and State ruled all over the British Isles until his death.

The Church of Ireland, consisting of a minority of Protestants in the midst of a Roman Catholic population, did not escape altogether the conflict of parties, but under the Irish Parliament and Archbishop Ussher the contest was softened, and his conception of episcopacy, reduced to a synodical form, was entirely acceptable to Presbyterians.*

The people of Scotland were excited by a continued attempt to force upon them English ceremonies and forms of worship, beginning in 1617 and continuing to become worse and worse until 1638. Then the nation revolted and signed the Second National Covenant, compelling the king, Charles I, to do the same, while the General Assembly, meeting in Glasgow, compelled the bishops to resign, so that Presbyterianism again became established by Law. In the meanwhile the Irish Church in 1634 had been browbeaten and compelled by the crown to adopt the English Articles and Canons of Law, the Irish archbishop being simply ignored.

In 1641 the civil war broke out between the king and the three Parliaments, Scottish, Irish, and English; and the Westminster Assembly was summoned to settle the Church government for the nation. Instead of pursuing a harmonious course, it adopted a rigid Presbyterianism and rejected Episcopacy on the one hand and Congregationalism on the other.

Theoretically, the Churches of England, Ireland, and Wales were governed by *Convocation*, a deliberative assembly of bishops and clergy of each province under the presidency of their archbishops. The relation of bishops to convocation is a variable one and capable of various modifications. The bishop is essentially an executive. He may

* This is given in Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, *Appendix*, pp. xvii *seq.*

usurp legislative and judicial functions; and this he did from the time of Elizabeth until the civil wars in England, but not in Scotland or Ireland, where Convocation and General Assembly had their rights until they were deprived of them by the interference of the crown. Convocation in England was deprived of deliberative powers in 1717 and has only begun to recover them since 1861. The bishops have gradually lost the greater part of their authority, and, indeed, there is very little government of any kind at present in the Church of England.

In the meanwhile the American Episcopal Church has organised itself with diocesan and general conventions in which all government is lodged. The House of Bishops in the General Convention has only co-ordinate authority with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. In the diocese the bishop has only *executive functions*. Episcopacy is capable of all these modifications.

If the Westminster Assembly had adopted the model of Archbishop Ussher, retaining bishops and synods, as in the historic plan of the Churches of Scotland and Ireland since the Reformation, there would have been no great difficulty in preserving the unity of these Churches, so far as Presbyterianism and Episcopacy are concerned. That which prevented the Assembly from taking this position, and led them in their *Form of Government* to reject bishops altogether, was the experience of the Church of Scotland for nearly a hundred years, in which the bishops had constantly violated the rights of General Assemblies and Synods, and had made themselves subservient to the crown in its despotism in Church as well as in State.

Indeed, the Westminster Confession of Faith does not define the church offices or deny the bishop. It simply says:

"The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate."

"To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit

sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the Word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require." (30[1-2].)

These sections were directed against Erastianism, as it is called, which makes the State supreme in religious as in civil affairs. They assert the sole authority of the officers of the Church in church affairs. So they say:

"As magistrates may lawfully call a synod of ministers and other fit persons to consult and advise with about matters of religion; so, if magistrates be open enemies to the Church, the ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their office, or they, with other fit persons, upon delegation from their churches, may meet together in such assemblies." (31[2].)

This recognises the right of magistrates to call synods, but also maintains that, if magistrates are open enemies of the Church, the ministers of the Church may meet in synods of their own authority.* This section was thrown out by the American General Assembly in the interest of the entire separation of Church and State.

The Presbyterian Form of Government, as organised in London in a provincial synod and twelve classes, or presbyteries, best shows the conception of the Westminster divines as to Church government. And the fullest statement of their position is given in the official *Jus divinum*, 1647, in answer to the questions proposed by Parliament to the Assembly.

"The receptacle of this power of church government is not the civil magistrate, as the Erastians contend, nor the *coetus fidelium* or body of the people, as presbyterated, or unpresbyterated, as the Separatists and Independents pretend, but *Christ's own officers* which He hath created *jure divino* in His Church. These officers are (1) pastors and teachers; (2) ruling elders; (3) deacons. The power of the keys or proper ecclesiastical power is distributed among these church officers so that the deacons have the care of the poor, the ruling elders and pastors com-

* The Church government of the Westminster divines is given in their *Advice concerning Church Government*, 1645.

bined the power of jurisdiction, the pastors and teachers the preaching of the Word and administration of sacraments. The Presbytery is the body of ruling elders and pastors having this power of jurisdiction which may be the lesser Assemblies, consisting of the ministers and ruling elders in each single congregation, called the parochial Presbytery, or congregational eldership; and the greater Assemblies, consisting of church governors *sent* from several churches and united into one body for government of all those churches within their own bounds. These greater Assemblies are either Presbyterial or Synodal-Presbyterial, consisting of the ministers and elders of several adjacent or neighbouring single congregations or parish churches, called the Presbytery or Classical Presbytery; Synodal, consisting of ministers and elders sent from Presbyterial Assemblies to consult and conclude about matters of common and great concernment to the Church within their limits; and these are either *Provincial*, embracing ministers and elders from several Presbyteries within one province; *National*, ministers and elders from several provinces within one nation; and *Œcumenical*, ministers and elders from the several nations within the whole Christian world. These are all of divine right, and there is a divine right of appeals from the lower to the higher bodies, and of the subordination of the lower to the higher in the authoritative judging and determining of causes ecclesiastical." *

The bishops are altogether omitted from *Christ's own officers, jure divino*. The Westminster divines would not deny that they might be *jure humano*. They could not regard them as of a higher order than presbyters except in jurisdiction. Their chief insistence was upon the equality of presbyter and bishop, according to the New Testament. They did, however, make the ruling elder a lower order in the ministry between pastor and deacons, and both *jure divino*, and so really recognised three orders of the ministry, but all parochial and not diocesan.

The most important thing they did was to distinguish the *ruling elder* as a separate order by divine right. This is most characteristic of historic Presbyterianism, except that the *divine institution* of the ruling elder has given place in the United States to the conception that he is a representative of the people.

Congregationalism differs from Presbyterianism and Epis-

* *V.* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 70–71.

copacy by denying any jurisdiction or authority to any synod or general body above the *congregation.* All the officers of the Church are officers of the congregation. In that Presbyterianism and Congregationalism agree. They differ as to Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies. Congregationalists recognise the importance of such gatherings of ministers for purposes of conference and ordination of ministers, but they refuse to these any superior jurisdiction whatever. All church power is in the congregation. The difference here is more nominal than real. This is evident from certain facts. The Congregationalists of New England adopted the *Cambridge Platform* in 1648 in a Synodical meeting. The Congregationalists of England adopted the *Savoy Declaration* in 1658 in a conference of ministers. These were regarded as tests of orthodoxy; and in the subscription controversy in England, in 1719, in the battle against Unitarians, the Presbyterians were opposed to subscription by a majority of fifty to twenty-six, whereas the Congregationalists voted for subscription in a majority of twenty-three to seven.*

The authority of the Synod or General Council was just as imperative—yes, more so, with the Congregational theory of advice and subscription than with the Presbyterian theory of jurisdiction without subscription. The Scotch, Irish, and American Presbyterians, indeed, at last adopted subscription also, but only after considerable controversy in Scotland, Ireland, and America. The English Presbyterians never had subscription to articles of any kind.†

There were, as we have seen in the references to Barrow and Browne,‡ two kinds of Congregationalists or Independents. So in this *Jus divinum* of 1647 two kinds are discriminated: (1) *the Presbyterated;* (2) the *Unpresbyterated.* The former agreed with the Presbyterians in putting the government of the congregation in the hands of the presbyters of the congregation; the latter put it in the hands of the whole body of the people.

* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism,* pp. 197 *seq.*

† *V.* Briggs, *American Presbyterianism,* pp. 194 *seq.*

‡ *V.* p. 394.

§ 4. *The Baptist Churches separated from the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, not because of differences of Faith, but only for differences as regards the institution of Baptism.*

The *Westminster Confession* does not differ in the Chapter on Baptism in any essential matter from the consensus of the Christian Church prior to the Reformation and subsequent thereto. It does, however, in order to avoid common errors in the Roman Catholic Church, take the following position:

"Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated."

"The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but *really exhibited and conferred* by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time." (28[5, 6].)

(1) *Baptism is not essential for salvation.* While it is a sin to neglect baptism, yet a person may be "regenerated and saved without it." This seems to be directly opposed to the Roman Catholic doctrine as defined in the Council of Trent, which anathematises any one who says, "that baptism is free, that is, not necessary unto salvation."*

This is qualified, not by the Council of Trent, but by the consensus of Roman Catholic theology, in the recognition of the baptism of desire, but no further.

Undoubtedly, the *Westminster Confession* would go further:

"Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, Who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word." (10[3].)

**On Baptism*, Canon 5.

(2) *Not all who are baptised are regenerated.* This was designed to limit regeneration to the elect. The Roman Catholics and Lutherans regard faith as necessary on the part of the person baptised, or his parents or sponsors. But this question has never been thoroughly explored by theologians, and there is a great amount of variation in their opinions.

(3) *The efficacy of baptism is not tied to the moment of time wherein it is administered.*

This was designed as ruling out the Roman Catholic *opus operatum:* but it involves an inconsistency; for while 28[6] states that "by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really *exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost*" in God's "appointed time," it represents that the grace is *conferred* by the use of the sacrament, although it may not be at the time of the sacrament. It may be offered and exhibited at a different time from the conferring of it. But it is difficult to see how it may be conferred *by* the sacrament and yet at a different *time* from the sacrament. It is also difficult to see how the sacrament of Baptism can be a *seal* of grace conferred subsequently.

These explanations and inconsistencies are due to efforts to explain baptism in accordance with sovereign election; but they do not change the fundamental doctrine that baptism is a sacrament instituted by Christ for perpetual observance as the means of the grace of regeneration, which is not only *promised, offered, exhibited,* and *signed,* but also *conferred* and *sealed thereby.*

The Congregationalists agreed to the Westminster doctrine of baptism. The Baptists disagreed, especially as the *Confession* ruled them out by its statements:

"Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person."

"Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." (28[3, 4].)

The *Baptist Confession* of 1688 substitutes for the Westminster Chapter on Baptism the following:

(1) "Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with Him in His death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into Him; of remission of sins; and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life.

(2) "Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in and obedience to our Lord Jesus, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance.

(3) "The outward element to be used in this ordinance is water, wherein the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

(4) "Immersion or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance."

(1) The chief Baptist principle is what is known as *believer's baptism*, the limitation of baptism to those who "actually profess repentance towards God, faith in and obedience to our Lord Jesus"; that is, those already regenerated and justified by faith. They absolutely reject infant baptism, and in this respect separate themselves from entire historical Christianity; and they do not hesitate to rebaptise those who have been baptised in infancy, regarding that as invalid baptism.

Acting on this principle, they do not recognise the Christians of the other Churches of the world, who, except in very extraordinary cases, have been baptised in infancy, as having any Christian baptism at all; and, as for centuries all Christians practically were baptised in infancy, the continuity of baptism was lost and had to be restored by rebaptism, and so it was restored by John Smyth, who on that account was called the Se-Baptist.*

The Baptist position also destroys the historical continuity between circumcision and baptism—the church membership of children and households—making it entirely individual. The historical continuity of the Church is thus destroyed.

* *V.* H. M. Dexter, *The True Story of John Smyth, the Se-Baptist*, 1881.

(2) This position compels the Baptists to abandon the consensus of Christianity that baptism is efficacious; and it is reduced to a mere *sign*. The grace of regeneration, faith, and justification have already been received; therefore there can be no efficacy in baptism itself, no conferring and sealing the grace of regeneration. Accordingly, the Westminster terms, *seal, offer, exhibit,* and *confer,* are omitted.

(3) The Baptists assert that "Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance." They reject all other modes of baptism, and in this respect go against the consensus of the Christian world and even the primitive Baptists themselves, who in the time of the Reformation as Anabaptists did not practise immersion. Even the earliest English Baptists did not. Immersion was first introduced into England as necessary among the Baptists in 1641. They then became divided for a time between the older Baptists called *Aspersi,* because they were but sprinkled, and the newer *Immersi,* because they were "overwhelmed in their Rebaptization." *

Gradually, however, the English Baptists became *Immersionists.* But they thereby again separated themselves from the consensus of Christianity; for while the Christian Church always recognised various modes of baptism as valid, yet the usual method in the West was pouring or sprinkling.

(4) The modern Baptists claim liberty of conscience as one of their special principles. But they have no special claim to it. The Westminster Assembly has a chapter on *Liberty of Conscience;* the Baptist Confession simply omits Section 4, but adds nothing to the chapter. Section 4 is as follows:

"And because the power which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exer-

* Ryves, *Mercurius Rusticus,* 1646, xvi, 224; *cf.* Dexter, *John Smyth,* p. 52.

cise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation, or to the power of godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices, as, either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church, and by the power of the Civil Magistrate." (20⁴.)

This puts certain limitations to liberty of conscience in the resisting or refusing of submission to civil or ecclesiastical authority, especially in matters of doctrine or institution. The Westminster divines recognised the right of resistance when conscience truly requires it; but what they reject is a "pretence of Christian liberty," which would be "destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church."

In fact, Baptists have not shown themselves any more tolerant than other Christians. There must be some restrictions upon liberty of opinion and practice, as all allow. I do not see that the restriction can be much better stated than by the Westminster divines; only their restriction needs to be interpreted. If interpreted in favour of Presbyterianism alone, against all other Christians, it is certainly an unreasonable restriction on liberty of conscience.

The question is, what is the "peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church?" Is it meant to exclude from toleration Baptists, Quakers, and the like? It was undoubtedly so interpreted by divines of the Westminster Assembly and by the New England Independents. The Baptists and Quakers never had the chance of external persecution by civil power, but they did use ecclesiastical censure and persecution just as vigorously as others.

Liberty of conscience as a practical thing has a long history: first *toleration* had to be won for this or that unpopular and unrecognised opinion and practice, before a general toleration was won at the British revolution in 1688; then the

separation of Church and State was first won by the American colonies after the Revolutionary War. Religious equality before the Law has been won in the United States and in Ireland, but not in England, Scotland, or Wales. *Recognition* has been only partially gained in the United States and Great Britain.

CHAPTER IX

THE MODERN CONSENSUS

We have already seen in *Particular Symbolics*, that the tendency in modern times in the Protestant world is toward a simplification in matters of dogma and institution, either by revision of the older Symbols, or by looser terms of subscription, or the construction of new and simpler Creeds, or by adherence to the Bible alone as a sufficient standard of Christian Faith. This general tendency has resulted in several important undertakings to reunite separated bodies on the basis of simple doctrinal standards. The most important of these are: (1) the union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Germany as Evangelical Churches in 1817 and subsequent years; (2) the foundation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846, and (3) the issue of the Chicago-Lambeth platform for the reunion of Christendom in 1888.

§ 1. *The Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the greater part of Germany united in* 1817 *and the years that followed, on the common basis of the principles of the Reformation and the consensus of Historic Christianity.*

The people of the Continent were worn out by the wars of Napoleon, and tired of the Infidelity and Atheism which spread all over Europe as a result of the French Revolution. The rally in Russia, Germany, and Austria to expel the invader was stimulated not only by the rebirth of patriotism, but also by a revival of religious and moral earnestness. This manifested itself in the Holy Alliance established by the three great sovereigns, the Czar of Russia of the Greek Church, the Emperor of Austria of the Roman

Church, and the King of Prussia of the Reformed Church, to which most other sovereigns also conformed. These resolved to maintain the principles of the Christian religion in their realms, and to tolerate the adherents of other Churches than their own. If only the Pope had taken the same position, a wide-spread movement for the reunion of Christendom might have begun.

The people of Germany were influenced more than those of other nations in this regard. They had suffered more than others in the Napoleonic wars, and had also become weary of the long three-cornered contest between Scholasticism, Pietism, and Rationalism, and were ready to follow competent leaders in religious revival and reform. Schleiermacher became their great leader, the father of modern German theology. He recalled theologians and the people to the fundamental religious principle of vital union and communion with God, and rallied theologians about a Christocentric Theology. It cannot be said that in all respects he was faithful either to historic Christianity or to historic Protestantism, but he did propose a platform upon which to rebuild a shattered Christianity. Schleiermacher was also a strong advocate of the union of the German Protestant Churches. The three-hundredth anniversary of the Theses of Luther recalled the German people to the fundamental principles of the Reformation. Some, like Harms, revived sectarian Lutheranism; but the majority of the Germans thought it a fitting occasion to do away with the conflicts of the past and to unite German Protestantism in one Evangelical Church, in which there should be the recognition of the right of Calvinistic and Lutheran, Melanchthonian and Zwinglian opinions. Unfortunately an effort to attain uniformity of worship, especially in Prussia, brought about conflicts. These disturbed the union but did not destroy it.

§ 2. *The Evangelical Alliance, composed of unofficial representatives of most Protestant Churches, adopted a doctrinal basis in* 1846, *which was regarded as the irreducible minimum*

of concord in historic Christianity of the ancient, mediæval, and Protestant Churches.

The Evangelical Alliance is a voluntary association of Christians of various evangelical denominations in different countries. The proposal was first made at a conference in Glasgow and renewed at Liverpool in 1845. The organisation was made in London in 1846 by representative Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, and others who could subscribe to the Evangelical consensus, which was agreed upon as follows:

"(1) The Divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.

"(2) The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

"(3) The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the persons therein.

"(4) The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall.

"(5) The incarnation of the Son of God, His work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and His mediatorial intercession and reign.

"(6) The justification of the sinner by faith alone.

"(7) The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

"(8) The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

"(9) The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Branch Alliances were formed in the chief countries of the world, each one being entirely independent of the others. General meetings have been held at London 1851, Paris 1855, Berlin 1857, Geneva 1861, Amsterdam 1867, New York 1873, Basel 1879, Copenhagen 1884, Florence 1891, London 1896 and 1907.

The Evangelical Alliance was distinctly Protestant. Roman Catholics, Greeks, and Orientals, and also ministers in the Church of England and other State Churches who were

mediæval in their tendencies, could not participate. On the other hand, Quakers, Universalists, and other minor Christian sects who could not subscribe to the platform in all respects were also excluded.

The Evangelical Alliance has lost its importance in great measure because of the organisation of great international denominational bodies, such as the Lambeth Convention of the Episcopal Churches, 1867; the Alliance of Reformed Churches of the Presbyterian order, 1875; the Ecumenical Conference of Methodism, 1881; the International Council of the Congregational Churches, 1891; the Baptist World Congress, 1905; all of which, like the Evangelical Alliance, are destitute of ecclesiastical power but have great influence upon the Christian Churches which they represent.

§ 3. *The Chicago-Lambeth Conference proposes as a basis for the reunion of Christendom the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the two Sacraments, and the historic Episcopate.*

In 1886 the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church issued a Declaration of the terms "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom." These were subsequently, after a slight revision, adopted by the Lambeth Conference, representing the Church of England and her daughters, in 1888, as follows:

"That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made toward Home Reunion: (*a*) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as 'containing all things necessary to salvation,' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith. (*b*) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith. (*c*) The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him. (*d*) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

"That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities

of the various branches of our communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with representatives of other Christian communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken either toward corporate Reunion or toward such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

"That this Conference recommends as of great importance, in tending to bring about Reunion, the dissemination of information respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies in use in the Anglican Church; and recommends that information be disseminated, on the other hand, respecting the authoritative standards of doctrine, worship, and government adopted by the other bodies of Christians into which the English-speaking races are divided." *

These terms of union proposed: (1) as the standard of Faith and Order, *the Holy Scriptures*. All Churches agree to this. (2) They offer as a doctrinal basis what is contained in the fundamental Symbols, *the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds;* to which all existing Christian Churches adhere. (3) As to Institutions of Worship, they propose *the two Sacraments*, which all Christian Churches celebrate in strict accord with the proposal. (4) *The Historic Episcopate* is given as the institution of Church government, adapted, however, to circumstances and localities without any theory as to its historic origin or succession. It would have been wiser if the term historic *ministry* had been used; for the term as it stands seems to emphasise the episcopate, and to ignore the presbyterate and diaconate. Undoubtedly, this was not designed. The episcopate was mentioned because it does not at present exist in some bodies which would be welcomed in the reunion, and it was just this that the Convention deemed it important to emphasise. It is the only term to which all existing Churches do not at present conform. However, the most of those Churches which have not the historic episcopate at present have no theoretical objection to it; for it has had its place in the history of Lutheran and Presbyterian

* *V.* Briggs, *Whither?* pp. 262–3.

Churches and now exists in some of them; and it can be readily adapted to Congregational as well as to the Presbyterian and Consistorial systems.

It is not proposed that any Church should abandon its own Symbols, but that, while retaining these and interpreting them in its own way, each Church should enter into a more comprehensive union with all other Christian Churches on the basis of the fundamental Faith and Institutions of Christianity.

Historic Christianity, as it exists at present, may be divided into three groups: the Greek and Oriental, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant. The Greek and Oriental Churches hold to the fundamental Faith of the Church as expressed in the Ecumenical Symbols. The tendency of the Protestant group is to simplify or abandon the symbols of the Reformation and of the seventeenth century in the direction of the ecumenical Symbols. The Roman Catholic Church adheres firmly to all the ecumenical Councils of that Church, and all the symbolic definitions of doctrine down to and including those of the Vatican Council, and is ready to make additional symbolical definitions whenever it may seem necessary or important.

Christian Symbolics seems to have brought us to a situation in which the reunion of Christ's Church is impossible so far as Faith is concerned.

If we were to make an historical and comparative study of Christian Institutions, the difficulty would not be lessened, but rather increased.

It should be said in behalf of the Roman Catholic position, that all the doctrines of Faith defined by that Church are important doctrines which ought to be defined; and if the definitions were such that the Christian world could agree to them, the concord would be an inestimable blessing. The question arises whether such definitions may be so explained, or modified by new statements, as to bring about such concord. In my opinion this is quite possible. But in the

meanwhile is the Christian Church to postpone reunion until such concord has been reached? Is it not evident that concord would be more likely in a reunited Church than in separated bodies, where various external interests tend to magnify the differences in Faith?

Our study has made it evident that there is a fundamental Christian Faith expressed in the Ecumenical Creeds, upon which the three great divisions of Christianity do actually agree. This constitutes a sufficient platform for reunion. It is also evident that each of the three divisions has its own particular symbols that are dear to it, and which it will not readily abandon. If the unity may be arranged in a supreme jurisdiction, on the basis of the fundamental Faith and Institutions of the Church, then the subordinate jurisdictions representing each of the three divisions, and the particular jurisdictions into which each of these are or may be divided, may still retain their particular symbols and particular institutions without any interference whatever on the part of the higher jurisdiction; just as in the American States each has its own special constitution and jurisdiction, all under the supreme jurisdiction of the United States, with a constitution which so limits its supreme power as to prevent any intrusion upon the jurisdiction of the States. What is possible, and has been actual and useful for more than a century in civil government, is just as possible and may be just as useful in ecclesiastical government. There will still remain questions of Faith and Institutions concerning which there may be differences, but as to these every jurisdiction should exercise the Christian grace of charity.

All Churches for the sake of unity should adhere faithfully to the Catholic principle of Vincent of Lérins, "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est,*" and the irenic principle of Rupertus Meldenius, "*In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas.*"

INDEX

INDEX

I. SUBJECTS

Absolution, 162, 299 *seq.*, 327.
Act of supremacy, 160; of uniformity, 191 *seq.*
Adiaphora, 187 *seq.*, 354 *seq.*
Adoptionism, 127, 130 *seq.*
Advent, Second, 51, 52, 71, 73 *seq.*, 88, 97, 137.
Albigenses, 133.
Alliance, Evangelical, 406 *seq.*
Anabaptists, 141, 167, 170 *seq.*, 176, 180, 197, 203, 242, 255 *seq.*, 271, 278, 359, 403.
Annates, 146, 160.
Anomœans, 86.
Answer of Jeremiah, 200 *seq.*
Antinomianism, 323.
Aphthardocetae, 118.
Apocrypha, 263, 264.
Apollinarianism, 86, 105 *seq.*, 109.
Arianism, 46, 49, 84 *seq.*, 99, 109, 243, 351, 359.
Arminianism, 12, 208 *seq.*, 219, 244, 319, 327, 360 *seq.*, 383 *seq.*
Ascension, 42, 52, 68, 70 *seq.*, 88, 285, 353.
Atonement, 137 *seq.*, 142, 162, 164, 267, 292, 310, 330 *seq.*, 335, 357 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 383, 385 *seq.*, 393, 408.
Augustinianism, 10, 127 *seq.*, 137, 183, 209 *seq.*, 259, 317 *seq.*, 337 *seq.*, 357, 364, 368, 372, 383.
Authority, divine, 255 *seq.*, 261 *seq.*, 268 *seq.*, 310.

Baptism, 34, 40 *seq.*, 79, 80, 87, 88, 99, 175, 177, 198, 256, 274 *seq.*, 299 *seq.*, 315 *seq.*, 339, 400 *seq.*; of desire, 66, 400; of infants, 170, 175, 266, 278, 400 *seq.*
Baptismal formula, 4, 42 *seq.*, 46, 278 *seq.*, 402.
Black rubric, 296.
Book of Common Prayer, 32, 185, 191 *seq.*, 216, 217, 266, 296, 297, 300 *seq.*
Burial of Christ, 42, 59 *seq.*, 88.

Calixtines, 188, 198.
Calvinism, 13, 179, 183, 193, 206, 208 *seq.*, 281 *seq.*, 319 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 383 *seq.*, 407.
"Cambridge Platform," 14, 220, 399.
Canon Law, 31, 32, 123, 126, 147, 151 *seq.*, 230; of Mass, 185 *seq.*; of Scripture, 263 *seq.*
Catechisms, 11, 37 (*v.* Symbols).
Ceremonies and rites, 32, 203 *seq.*, 294 *seq.*, 308 *seq.*, 354 *seq.*
Christ, 41 *seq.*, 61; divinity of, 49, 50, 55, 60, 83 *seq.*, 99, 105 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*, 138, 243, 285, 342, 349 *seq.*; humanity of, 56 *seq.*, 83, 105 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*, 119 *seq.*, 135, 138, 203 *seq.*, 285, 342, 350 *seq.*; as King, 71 *seq.*, 86, 88, 97, 139, 141, 331, 333, 408; as Logos, 53, 84, 86, 89, 106, 109, 112 *seq.*, 120, 135, 350, 352; as Lord, 41 *seq.*, 49 *seq.*, 61, 68, 102 *seq.*; as Priest, 71 *seq.*, 134, 139, 141, 331, 333 *seq.*; as Prophet, 71 *seq.*, 141; as Saviour, 4, 42 *seq.*, 50 *seq.*, 61, 62, 71, 73, 83, 96, 111, 137, 170, 310 *seq.*, 385 *seq.*, 393, 408; as second Adam, 56 *seq.*, 71, 390 *seq.*; as Son of God (*v.* God).
Christian Scientists, 28, 250.
Church, 6, 44, 71 *seq.*, 77 *seq.*, 140 *seq.*, 177 *seq.*, 220, 255 *seq.*, 333, 357; Apostolicity, Catholicity, and Sanctity of, 42, 77 *seq.*, 88, 99, 140 *seq.*, 268 *seq.*, 332; unity of, 77 *seq.*, 88, 99, 134, 140 *seq.*,

234 *seq.*, 268 *seq.*, 332, 406 *seq.*; and state, 144 *seq.*, 159 *seq.*, 223, 235, 257, 260, 412.
Churches, of Reformation, 5 *seq.*, 10, 199, 121, 242 *seq.*, 252, 411 *seq.*; Anglican, 6, 13 *seq.*, 32, 121, 160, 174, 184, 191 *seq.*, 202, 209 *seq.*, 215 *seq.*, 233, 243 *seq.*, 249, 252, 257 *seq.*, 264 *seq.*, 279, 282, 289, 295 *seq.*, 300, 307, 339, 343, 345, 372, 379, 381, 393 *seq.*, 408; Baptist, 14 *seq.*, 29, 32, 219 *seq.*, 250, 266, 359, 372, 374, 385, 400 *seq.*, 408 *seq.*; Bohemian, 184, 197 *seq.*, 244, 408; Congregational, 14, 29, 219 *seq.*, 243, 245, 250, 266, 372, 374, 385, 400 *seq.*, 408 *seq.*; Greek and Oriental, 6, 10, 29, 32, 35, 98 *seq.*, 117 *seq.*, 121, 126, 127, 136, 142 *seq.*, 152 *seq.*, 188, 200 *seq.*, 230, 250, 252 *seq.*, 279, 295 *seq.*, 408, 411 *seq.*; Irish, 13, 215 *seq.*, 393, 395; Lutheran, 6, 11 *seq.*, 121, 202, 205, 250, 252, 257 *seq.*, 278 *seq.*, 289, 295, 298, 300, 307, 406 *seq.*; Methodist, 15, 29, 243 *seq.*, 250, 372, 408 *seq.*; Presbyterian, 29, 219, 242 *seq.*, 248 *seq.*, 330, 362, 372, 374, 381 *seq.*, 400 *seq.*, 408 *seq.*; Protestant Episcopal, 29, 250, 396, 408 *seq.*; Reformed, 6, 12 *seq.*, 121, 173, 184, 193, 197, 201, 202, 208 *seq.*, 245, 250, 252, 257 *seq.*, 264, 278 *seq.*, 282, 295, 298, 307, 338 *seq.*, 345, 349, 352, 370 *seq.*, 406, 408; Roman, 5 *seq.*, 10 *seq.*, 29, 32 *seq.*, 99, 119, 121, 123 *seq.*, 153 *seq.*, 177, 195, 221 *seq.*, 249 *seq.*, 257 *seq.*, 299 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 408, 411 *seq.*; Scotch, 32, 174, 209, 215 *seq.*, 243 *seq.*, 296, 393 *seq.*
Communication of properties, 116 *seq.*, 349 *seq.*, 383.
Communion in both kinds, 201, 282 *seq.*, 294 *seq.*, 347 *seq.*; of saints, 42, 77 *seq.*, 384.
Conference at Altenburg, 204; Baden, 174; Chicago-Lambeth, 406, 409 *seq.*; Dresden, 204; Frankfort, 204; Hagenau, 188; Leipzig, 207; Lichtenberg, 204; Marburg, 174 *seq.*, 181, 272, 282; Naumburg, 204; Ratisbon, 20 *seq.*, 188 *seq.*, 313; Weimar, 338; Wittenberg, 204; Worms, 188, 318; Zerbst, 204.
Confession, 162, 175, 177, 299, 302 *seq.*, 327.
Confessions of faith (*v.* Symbols).
Confirmation, 274, 278 *seq.*
Consensus, 15, 19 *seq.*, 26 *seq.*, 33, 133 *seq.*, 140 *seq.*, 178, 208, 224, 242, 251 *seq.*, 352, 400, 406 *seq.*
Constitution of Apostles, 36.
Consubstantial, 87 *seq.*, 98, 104, 111 *seq.*
Consubstantiation, 281 *seq.*
Contrition, 162, 299, 301 *seq.*
Conversion (Eucharistic), 23, 131 *seq.*, 281 *seq.*
Councils and Synods, at Alexandria, 110; Amsterdam, 378; Antioch, 48, 83; Basel, 126, 142, 152, 165; Cambridge, 220; Carthage, 127; Chalcedon, 6, 8, 83, 87, 101, 106, 109 *seq.*, 124 *seq.*, 131; Constance, 126, 142, 152, 165, 166; Constantinople, 8, 63, 83, 86, 101, 103, 109, 110, 117 *seq.*, 124, 126; Cracow, 197; Dort, 12, 203, 208 *seq.*, 252, 360 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 378 *seq.*, 383 *seq.*; Ecumenical, 10 *seq.*, 125 *seq.*; Emden, 193; Ephesus, 8, 110, 111, 127; Florence, 6, 10, 126, 132, 136 *seq.*, 142 *seq.*, 152, 154, 188, 251, 295; Frankfort, 127, 130, 131; Jassy, 201; Jerusalem, 200, 201; Kieff, 201; Lateran, 10, 126, 133, 135; Lyons, 126, 136 *seq.*; Milevius, 127; Nicæa, 63, 83 *seq.*, 124, 125; Orange, 10, 127 *seq.*; Paris, 193; Petricow, 197; Pisa, 152; Pistoria, 221; Rome, 10, 127, 131 *seq.*; Seville, 130; Sens, 135; Sirmium, 63; Sutri, 123; Thorn, 197; Toledo, 8, 64, 87; Tours, 135; Trent, 14, 16, 134, 159, 185, 195 *seq.*; 201, 221 *seq.*, 230; Vatican, 14, 17, 224 *seq.*; 253, 273, 411; Vercelli, 132; Vienne, 126; Vladislav, 197.
Counsels of Perfection, 149, 326.
Creed, 5 *seq.*, 30 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 266 *seq.*; Apostles', 3 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 40 *seq.*, 83 *seq.*, 88, 95 *seq.*, 100 *seq.*, 140, 183, 205, 328, 409 *seq.*; of

Aquileia, 40, 63; Athanasian, 5, 34 *seq.*, 50, 64, 94, 97, 98, 100 *seq.*, 109, 136, 205; Chalcedonian, 6, 107 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*, 352, 383; Constantinopolitan, 8, 60, 72, 75 *seq.*, 80, 87, 89 *seq.*, 101 *seq.*, 201, 203, 360 *seq.*; of Cyril, 43, 77 *seq.*, 87 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*; Eastern, 62, 67, 79; of Epiphanius, 75, 77, 87, 89 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*; of Eusebius, 72, 75, 85, 88 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*; Gallican, 78; Nicene, 4 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 49, 60, 62, 72, 75, 83 *seq.*, 100 *seq.*, 125, 136, 140, 201, 205, 265, 382, 383, 409 *seq.*; of Niceta, 81; Roman, 40 *seq.*; 60 *seq.*, 77 *seq.*, 96; of Venantius Fortunatus, 64.
Crucifixion of Christ, 42, 52, 59 *seq.*, 88, 132, 137 *seq.*, 286, 292, 364 *seq.*, 391.

Deism, 236 *seq.*, 272.
Didache, 36, 42, 46.
Didascalia, 36.
Diet of Augsburg, 12, 20, 176 *seq.*, 187, 191, 192; Ratisbon, 188 *seq.*; Speier, 171 *seq.*; Worms, 166 *seq.*, 172.
Disciples of Christ, 248, 250.
Docetism, 83.
Doctrines of faith and morals, 14, 22, 29, 30, 33, 223, 229 *seq.*, 252, 273, 274.
Donatists, 27.
Dynamists, 48, 83 *seq.*, 99.

Ebionites, 53, 57, 99.
Ecthesis, 119.
Effectual calling, 313, 317, 370, 377, 383.
Enthronement of Christ, 52, 59, 71 *seq.*, 132, 285.
Epiphany, 74.
Episcopate, historic, 409 *seq.*
Erastianism, 397.
Eucharist, 20, 33, 87, 116, 126, 127, 131 *seq.*, 139, 174 *seq.*, 181, 183, 201, 203 *seq.*, 256, 271, 274 *seq.*, 279, 281 *seq.*, 332 *seq.*, 346 *seq.*, 386 *seq.*, 408 *seq.*
Eudoxians, 86.
Eunomians, 86.
Eutychianism, 101, 107, 112 *seq.*, 351.
Exaltation of Christ, 61, 71, 116, 351 *seq.*, 354.

Faith, the Christian, 3 *seq.*, 27 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 51, 59, 83 *seq.*, 91, 99, 100 *seq.*, 120, 236, 406 *seq.*
Filioque, 35, 98, 125, 135, 201, 251.
Flacianism, 337 *seq.*
Foreknowledge, 357 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*
Forgiveness of sins, 42 *seq.*, 71, 78 *seq.*, 88, 99, 128, 312 *seq.*, 330 *seq.*, 342, 345, 393.
Freedom, of conscience, 259 *seq.*, 264, 357, 384, 403 *seq.*, 408, 412; of will, 127 *seq.*, 170, 177, 179, 319 *seq.*, 357, 360 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 383.
Friends, 32, 242, 343 (*v.* Quakers).

Gnosticism, 27, 53, 57, 58, 83, 99.
God, the Father, 4, 41 *seq.*, 50, 56, 61, 68, 72, 76, 84, 87 *seq.*, 102 *seq.*, 111, 365; the Son, 4, 41 *seq.*, 46 *seq.*, 68, 76, 83 *seq.*, 87 *seq.*, 102 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*, 130 *seq.*, 311, 365, 393, 408; the Holy Spirit, 4, 41 *seq.*, 52, 58 *seq.*, 71, 72, 75 *seq.*, 83 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*, 102 *seq.*, 106, 126, 135 *seq.*, 140, 258, 275 *seq.*, 283, 313 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*, 408; the Trinity, 50, 58, 75 *seq.*, 83 *seq.*, 94 *seq.*, 100 *seq.*, 115 *seq.*, 130, 135, 175, 243, 256, 285, 382, 408; the Creator, 41, 44 *seq.*, 61, 87 *seq.*, 226, 382; attributes of, 138 *seq.*, 363, 388 *seq.*; decree of, 209 *seq.*, 312 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*, 382; grace of, 127 *seq.*, 207, 261, 267, 275 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 319 *seq.*, 332, 342, 360 *seq.*; majesty of, 137 *seq.*, 162, 349 *seq.*, 383, 388 *seq.*; sovereignty of, 50, 129 *seq.*, 137, 209 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*
God-man, 58 *seq.*, 105 *seq.*, 140.
Good works, 175, 177 *seq.*, 187, 203 *seq.*, 259, 314 *seq.*, 322 *seq.*, 342 *seq.*, 384.
Government, ecclesiastical, 186, 215 *seq.*, 266, 393 *seq.*, 412.

Hades, 81, 385; ascent from, 65 *seq.*, 71; descent into, 42, 60, 63 *seq.*, 75, 203 *seq.*, 328, 353 *seq.*, 391.

Henoticon, 117, 118.
Henotics, 23.
Hierarchy, 141, 256, 333 *seq.*
Homoousion, 91 *seq.*
Humanists, 8, 158 *seq.*, 169 *seq.*
Humiliation of Christ, 61, 116, 349 *seq.*, 354.
Hypostasis, 93 *seq.*, 103, 111 *seq.*, 115, 117.

Images, use of, 125, 169, 174, 309.
Immaculate conception, 14, 223 *seq.*
Immersion, 403.
Incarnation of Christ, 51 *seq.*, 61, 86, 88, 95 *seq.*, 100 *seq.*, 105 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*, 135, 137 *seq.*, 342, 349 *seq.*, 391 *seq.*, 393, 408.
Independents, 14, 216 *seq.*, 404.
Indulgence, doctrine of, 162 *seq.*, 165, 303 *seq.*
Indulgences, sale of, 162 *seq.*, 169, 303.
Infralapsarianism, 209 *seq.*, 373, 379.
Institutions, Christian, 13, 27 *seq.*, 140 *seq.*, 148, 177 *seq.*, 183, 193, 203, 233 *seq.*, 245, 247 *seq.*, 252, 274 *seq.*, 332, 384, 400 *seq.*, 411.
Interimistic Controversy, 187 *seq.*
Interims, Augsburg, 187 *seq.*, 355; Leipzig, 190, 355; Ratisbon, 187 *seq.*
Intermediate state, 64, 67, 81, 305, 322 *seq.*, 327 *seq.*, 335, 385.
Irenics, 20 *seq.*

Jansenism, 221 *seq.*
Judgment, of Christ, 42, 52, 65, 73 *seq.*, 81, 88, 97, 177, 385, 408.
Julianists, 115.
Justification, 23, 67, 70, 79, 139, 175, 177 *seq.*, 183, 188, 201, 203 *seq.*, 259 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 326 *seq.*, 335, 341 *seq.*, 345, 369 *seq.*, 383, 391 *seq.*, 403, 408.

Kenosis, 351 *seq.*

Law, use of, 203 *seq.*, 345 *seq.*, 384.
Life everlasting, 42, 80 *seq.*, 88, 99, 345.
Literature on: Polemics, 18 *seq.*; positive theology, 7 *seq.*, symbolics, 4 *seq.*, 11 *seq.*, 24 *seq.*; symbols, Anglican, 192 *seq.*; Baptist, 220; Congregational, 220; Ecumenical, 36 *seq.*; Greek, 202; Lutheran, 179 *seq.*, 186, 189 *seq.*, 205 *seq.*; Reformed (Continental), 182, 185, 194 *seq.*, 197 *seq.*, 209, 212 *seq.*, 214 *seq.*; Roman, 196, 222, 225, 232 *seq.*; Westminster, 217 *seq.*
Liturgies, 31, 32, 37, 183, 186, 215, 293, 299, 329.
Lollards, 197 *seq.*
Love, 45, 61, 62, 140, 259, 314 *seq.*, 326, 342 *seq.*, 363, 388 *seq.*
Lutheranism, 8, 168 *seq.*, 176 *seq.*, 407.

Macedonians, 86, 97, 99, 100, 103.
Manichæism, 337 *seq.*
Marcellians, 86.
Marcionites, 351.
Marriage, 154 *seq.*, 174, 177, 187 *seq.*, 201, 274, 306 *seq.*
Massilians, 128.
Mennonites, 242.
Merit, 310 *seq.*, 335, 339 *seq.*, 343 *seq.*
Methodism, 242 *seq.*, 302, 317, 321, 371 *seq.*
Ministry, the Christian, 28, 33, 140 *seq.*, 148, 177, 256 *seq.*, 268 *seq.*, 306, 333 *seq.*, 408 *seq.*
Miracles, 57 *seq.*, 115, 237 *seq.*, 288.
Modalism, 48 *seq.*, 83 *seq.*, 86, 99, 243, 244.
Modernism, 234 *seq.*
Monarchianism, 46 *seq.*, 83 *seq.*, 92 *seq.*, 99.
Monasticism, 148 *seq.*, 177, 223.
Monophysitism, 6, 105 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*, 130 *seq.*, 352.
Monothelitism, 6, 8, 119 *seq.*, 131.
Montanism, 27, 48.
Moravians, 199, 244.
Mormons, 28, 250.
Mysticism, 17, 247, 258.

Nestorianism, 101, 105 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*, 130 *seq.*, 351 *seq.*
Nihilianism, 126, 135.

Old Catholics, 230 *seq.*, 253.
Order, 233, 270 *seq.*, 274, 305 *seq.*

Orders, religious, 123, 148, 150, 158 *seq.*, 182 *seq.*, 222 *seq.*, 257 *seq.*; Oratory of Divine Love, 161, 182; Society of Jesus, 17, 23, 182 *seq.*, 195, 222 *seq.*, 302.
Original Sin, 127 *seq.*, 162, 177, 188, 203 *seq.*, 213, 224 *seq.*, 267, 310, 317 *seq.*, 331, 337 *seq.*, 342, 357 *seq.*, 375 *seq.*, 382, 408.

Pantheism, 45, 225 *seq.*, 246, 272.
Papal infallibility, 14, 229 *seq.*; supremacy, 23, 124, 152, 159 *seq.*, 222, 226 *seq.*, 333; tyranny, 144 *seq.*
Parousia, 73 *seq.*
Passion of Christ, 42, 60 *seq.*, 88, 292, 342.
Patripassians, 49.
Pelagianism, 127 *seq.*, 310, 337 *seq.*
Penance, 162, 164, 274, 299 *seq.*, 327 *seq.*
Pentecost, 43, 65, 71, 75, 77, 280.
Philippists, 179, 340, 345, 347, 356.
Philosophy of Aristotle, 6 *seq.*, 91, 134, 154, 236; Plato, 154, 236, 247.
Photinians, 86.
Pietism, 9, 244, 245, 302, 317, 359, 370, 407.
Plymouth Brethren, 250, 321, 337.
Pneumatomachi, 86, 97, 100, 102, 103.
Polemics, 9, 15 *seq.*, 19, 24, 28.
Polytheism, 45, 46, 84, 95.
Predestination, 129, 203 *seq.*, 357 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*
Pre-existence of Christ, 48, 56, 60, 106, 286.
Presbyterianism, 9, 15, 16, 174, 183, 215 *seq.*, 242 *seq.*, 266, 321, 393 *seq.*
Priesthood, 133 *seq.*, 141, 149, 255 *seq.*, 332.
Purgatory, 163, 174, 305, 327 *seq.*, 335.
Puritans, 9, 13, 198, 209, 215, 244, 260, 264, 266, 278, 295 *seq.*, 298, 302, 372, 384.

Quakers, 32, 242, 287, 313, 343, 359, 370, 404, 409.

Rationalism, 225 *seq.*, 245 *seq.*, 272, 359, 407.
Reason, 225 *seq.*, 236, 247, 255 *seq.*, 271 *seq.*
Reformation, 6, 7, 11, 16 *seq.*, 20, 31, 32, 37, 122, 126, 129 *seq.*, 137, 139 *seq.*, 158 *seq.*, 242, 248, 251 *seq.*, 278 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 400, 406.
Regeneration, 59 *seq.*, 76, 80, 242, 277 *seq.*, 313 *seq.*, 322, 339, 342, 346, 366 *seq.*, 391, 393, 401 *seq.*
Remonstrants, 211 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*
Repentance, 43, 71, 79, 99, 162 *seq.*, 177 *seq.*, 300 *seq.*, 319, 327 *seq.*, 345 *seq.*, 364 *seq.*, 383.
Reservation of the Sacrament, 289, 294 *seq.*
Responsio, 178 *seq.*, 311, 318.
Resurrection, of Christ, 42, 51 *seq.*, 62, 66, 67 *seq.*, 88, 237, 284, 337 *seq.*, 349 *seq.*, 353; of man, 42, 44, 59, 67, 80 *seq.*, 88, 99, 101, 327 *seq.*, 385, 408.
Ritschlians, 58.

Sabellianism, 83 *seq.*, 92, 99, 104, 130.
Sacramentarians, 172 *seq.*
Sacraments, 8, 28, 66, 128, 133, 140 *seq.*, 170, 177, 201, 220, 252, 258, 268 *seq.*, 274 *seq.*, 327, 347 *seq.*, 354 *seq.*, 385, 408 *seq.*
Sacrifice, 73, 132, 134, 139 *seq.*, 170, 174, 186, 289 *seq.*, 330 *seq.*, 347 *seq.*, 385 *seq.*
Saints, invocation of, 174, 177 *seq.*, 186 *seq.*, 308 *seq.*, 335; perseverance of, 327, 358, 360 *seq.*, 371, 384.
Salvation Army, 287, 321.
Sanctification, 313, 328 *seq.*, 335 *seq.*, 345, 383, 408.
Satisfaction, 137 *seq.*, 162, 164, 178, 187, 299, 303 *seq.*, 328, 330 *seq.*, 345, 383, 385 *seq.*
Saumur, School of, 213 *seq.*, 366 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*
Scholasticism, 6 *seq.*, 12, 16 *seq.*, 37, 123, 133 *seq.*, 141, 147 *seq.*, 154, 159, 164, 169, 183, 224, 247, 288, 294, 337, 352, 359, 389, 407.
Schwenckfeldians, 359.
Scriptures, Holy, 5 *seq.*, 11, 16, 21,

36 *seq.*, 120, 154, 158 *seq.*, 166 *seq.*, 169 *seq.*, 175 *seq.*, 183, 205, 231, 255 *seq.*, 346, 354 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 382, 388, 408 *seq.*
Semi-Arianism, 86, 99, 104, 112, 242 *seq.*
Semi-Pelagianism, 127 *seq.*, 310, 337 *seq.*
Session of Christ, 42, 51, 52, 71 *seq.*, 88.
Severians, 115.
Shema, 44.
Sheol, 64, 385.
Socinians, 139, 242, 271 *seq.*
Supralapsarianism, 209 *seq.*, 378 *seq.*
Swedenborgians, 28.
Symbol, term, 4 *seq.*, 10 *seq.*; of Fish, 4, 44, 46 *seq.*, 50, 96.
Symbolics, term, 3 *seq.*, 8 *seq.*, 24 *seq.*; discipline of, 3 *seq.*, 203, 242; comparative, 18 *seq.*, 36, 122, 251 *seq.*; fundamental, 5 *seq.*, 26 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*; particular, 10 *seq.*, 26 *seq.*, 121 *seq.*, 251 *seq.*, 274, 337, 373, 382, 406.
Symbols, Ecumenical (*v.* Creeds); of Reformation, 158 *seq.*, 200, 202, 254, 320, 411.
Symbols, Greek, 200 *seq.*, 329.
Symbols, Protestant, 11 *seq.*, 29 *seq.*; *Anglican Articles*, 5, 13, 15, 191 *seq.*, 216, 243, 264 *seq.*, 292 *seq.*, 315, 326, 328, 331, 383, 386, 395; *Westminster*, 215 *seq.*, 252; *Catechism*, 215 *seq.*, 243; *Confession*, 13 *seq.*, 203, 215 *seq.*, 237, 276, 313 *seq.*, 321, 361 *seq.*, 375 *seq.*, 382 *seq.*; *Lesser Symbols*, 12 *seq.*, 193 *seq.*, 210 *seq.*, 220, 364, 399 *seq.* Lutheran, 11, 29; *Augsburg Confession*, 11 *seq.*, 176 *seq.*, 184, 186 *seq.*, 191, 205 *seq.*, 263, 265, 268, 274, 281, 292, 303, 311 *seq.*, 347, 355, 359; *Apology for*, 11, 176 *seq.*, 205, 313, 318; *Catechisms of Luther*, 11 *seq.*, 205, 276, 281; *Book of Concord*, 11 *seq.*, 179 *seq.*, 205; *Formula of Concord*, 5, 11 *seq.*, 203 *seq.*, 252, 263, 277, 281, 312 *seq.*, 319, 333, 337 *seq.*, 367, 370, 384; *Lesser Symbols*, 11, 174 *seq.*, 185 *seq.*, 204 *seq.*, 282, 333. Reformed (Continental), 12, 29, 263; *Belgic*, 12, 193, 270, 318 *seq.*, 321, 325, 332; *of Bern*, 174, 263, 335; *of Dort*, 12, 203, 208 *seq.*, 360 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 383 *seq.*; *Gallican*, 12, 193, 265, 270, 282 *seq.*, 324, 331; *Heidelberg*, 12, 193 *seq.*, 301; *I Helvetic*, 12, 185, 263, 267, 331; *II Helvetic Confession*, 12, 194, 196 *seq.*, 263, 278, 374; *Helvetic Consensus*, 13, 213 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 382; *Tetrapolitan*, 12, 180 *seq.*; *Zwinglian*, 169 *seq.*, 180 *seq.*, 263, 331 *seq.*; *Lesser Symbols*, 12, 185, 193 *seq.*, 206 *seq.*
Symbols, Roman, 29, 221 *seq.*, 253; *Catechism*, 195 *seq.*, 275 *seq.*, 284, 304 *seq.*; *Canons of Trent*, 14, 195 *seq.*, 263 *seq.*, 270 *seq.*, 278 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 338, 340, 386, 400; *of Vatican*, 14, 225 *seq.*
Synergism, 203 *seq.*, 339 *seq.*

Taborites, 198.
Te Deum, 5, 8.
Theology, comparative, 22, 31; positive, 6 *seq.*, 16, 22, 37, 169, 183; old and new school, 213 *seq.*, 217 *seq.*, 373 *seq.*, 384.
Theotokos, 109 *seq.*
Tome of Leo, 107, 111.
Tractarian Movement, 249.
Tradition, 11, 21, 264 *seq.*
Transubstantiation, 23, 133 *seq.*, 178, 281 *seq.*, 295, 347 *seq.*
Typos, 119.

Unction, 274, 280, 308, 327 *seq.*
Unitarianism, 242, 359, 382, 399.
Universalism, 213, 364 *seq.*, 377 *seq.*, 409.
Unity, of God, 43 *seq.*, 84 *seq.*, 102 *seq.*, 408; of Christ, 105 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*, 130 *seq.*; of the Church, 23, 77 *seq.*, 123, 142, 152, 154, 161, 230, 234, 235, 406 *seq.*
Utraquists, 198.

Verbal Inspiration, 213, 373 *seq.*, 379 *seq.*
Virgin Birth, 41, 51 *seq.*, 61, 75, 96, 105 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*, 132 *seq.*, 237.

Waldensians, 152, 184, 197 *seq.*, 295.

Westminster Assembly, 215 *seq.*, 242, 266, 364, 374, 376 *seq.*, 382 *seq.*
Words of Institution, 132, 275 *seq.*, 281 *seq.*
Works of Supererogation, 323 *seq.*, 336, 384.
Yahweh, 43 *seq.*, 50, 56, 61.
Zwinglians, 171 *seq.*, 180 *seq.*

II. NAMES

Abelard, 5, 7, 135, 138.
Acacius, 117.
Æpinus, 353.
Agatho, 120.
Agricola, 175, 190, 345.
Albertus Magnus, 8, 293.
Alberus, 18.
Alcuin, 131.
Alexander of Alexandria, 84.
Alexander Hales, 5.
Alexander III, 135.
Allen, 30.
Alphen, 194.
Alsted, 9.
Alting, 194.
Ambrose, 37, 40, 42.
Amling, 206.
Amsdorf, 190, 344.
Amyraut (Amyraldus), 213, 214, 373.
Andreae, J., 18, 200, 204.
Andreae, L., 187.
Andrew of Samosata, 110.
Anselm, 137 *seq.*, 267, 386.
Anton, 206.
Apollinaris, 107, 109.
Aquila, C., 191.
Aquinas, Thomas, 5, 8, 43, 137, 139, 159, 164, 224, 240, 294, 378, 386, 389.
Aristotle, 58, 91, 150, 154, 247.
Arius, 60, 84.
Arminius, 211 *seq.*
Artemon, 48.
Aspileneta, 18.
Athanasius, 36, 63, 94, 100.
Augusti, 222.
Augustine, 3, 4, 36, 37, 40, 50, 100, 103, 107, 127, 129, 137, 157, 183, 224, 249, 259, 267, 275.
Augustus of Saxony, 204.
Aymon, 194, 214.

Bähr, 4.
Baier, A. H., 26.
Baier, J. W., 38.
Balthasar, 176, 206.
Barclay, 220.
Barlaeus, 212.
Barnaud, 215.
Barneveldt, 211.
Baro, 210.
Barrett, 210.
Barrow, Henry, 394, 399.
Barrow, Isaac, 37.
Barthlet, 18.
Baschet, 196.
Basil, 94, 329.
Bassi, 182.
Baudin, 7.
Bäumer, 39.
Baumgarten, 19, 206.
Baur, 25, 113, 246.
Baxter, 21, 244, 374.
Bechmann, 19.
Beck, F. A., 13.
Beck, J. C., 185.
Bellegarde, 222.
Berengarius, 10, 131, 132.
Berg, 21.
Bergius, 208.
Bernard, 137, 138.
Bernhold, 19.
Bernoulli, 39.
Bertram, 186.
Beutel, 190.
Beza, 194, 209, 267, 358.
Bezold, 199.
Bickel, 232.
Biddle, 242.
Bidembach, 204.
Bieck, 190.
Bifield, 37.
Bindley, 39.
Blass, 53.
Blaurock, 170.
Blondel, 378, 379.
Blunt, 193.
Böckel, 13.
Bod, 195.
Bodemann, 13, 25.
Böhl, 197.

Bomberg, 158.
Bonaventura, 8, 137.
Borromeo, 195.
Bossuet, 18, 23.
Brandt, 194.
Brent, 196.
Brenz, 175, 185 *seq.*, 350.
Brès, Guy de, 193.
Brieger, 176, 189.
Brischar, 196.
Browne, E. H., 192.
Browne, Robert, 394, 399.
Brück, 178.
Bucer, 12, 20, 173 *seq.*, 181, 182, 184, 185, 188, 189, 191, 279, 282, 347.
Buchmann, 26.
Buckley, 196.
Buddeus, 18.
Bugenhagen, 176, 186, 187.
Bull, 37.
Bullinger, 8, 18, 37, 184, 185, 193, 196.
Bungener, 196.
Burckhardt, 185.
Burg, 26.
Burn, 39, 40.
Burnet, 192.
Butler, Charles, 24.
Butler, C. M., 193.

Cajetan, 162, 165.
Calamy, 374, 377, 378.
Calderwood, 194.
Calinich, 180.
Calixtus I, 83.
Calixtus, George, 9, 21, 208.
Calovius, 207, 208, 212.
Calvin, 7, 8, 12, 37, 151, 161, 173, 183, 184, 193, 194, 209, 259, 260, 267, 270, 279, 282, 329, 330, 347, 357, 368.
Camerarius, 199.
Cameron, 213.
Campbell, Alexander, 248.
Campbell, Thomas, 248.
Campeggio, 188.
Cano, 159.
Capito, 12, 174, 188.
Cappellus, 213, 214, 380.
Caraffa, 182.
Carcereri, 196.
Cardoni, 232.
Cardwell, 192.
Carleton, George, 379.
Carlstadt, 166, 170, 175, 176.
Carlton, D., 212.
Carpzov, 12.
Carroll, 249.
Cartwright, 9, 394.
Caspari, 38, 40, 78.
Cassander, 20, 21.
Cattenburgh, 212, 213.
Cecconi, 233.
Chalmers, 248.
Chandieu, 193.
Charlemagne, 123, 130, 131.
Charles I of England, 215, 393, 395.
Charles II, 192.
Charles V, Emperor, 145.
Charles IX of Sweden, 187.
Chemnitz, 204, 350.
Chifflet, 196.
Christian William of Brandenburg, 208.
Chytræus, 180, 204.
Clement of Alexandria, 66.
Clement VII, 145.
Cnoglerus, 5, 37.
Coccius, 9.
Cochlæus, 176, 178, 181, 187, 189.
Cœlestine I, 109, 110.
Colet, 159.
Colonia, 222.
Colton, 243.
Comenius, 208, 244.
Conrad, 8.
Constans II, 119.
Constantine, 84.
Constantine Pogonatus, 119, 120.
Cornerus, 204.
Cornford, 193.
Coster, 18.
Courayer, 196.
Covel, 202.
Cranmer, 161, 184, 191, 267.
Creuzer, 4.
Crocius, 208, 379.
Cromwell, 216.
Crosby, 220.
Cruciger, 37.
Crusius, 200.
Cunerus, 18.
Curtis, 28.
Cusanus, 161.
Cyprian, 34, 41, 79.
Cyprian, E. S., 180.
Cyril of Alexandria, 109 *seq.*, 115, 118.

Cyril of Jerusalem, 43, 63, 67, 77, 80, 87, 89, 90, 96, 97, 99, 280, 329.

Damasus, 8.
Daniel, E., 193.
Dannenmayer, 19.
Danz, 14, 196.
Davenant, 379.
Davey, 192.
Delitzsch, 68.
Denzinger, 14, 132, 221, 225.
Deodatus, 196.
Descartes, 236.
De Witte, 194.
Dexter, 220, 394, 402, 403.
Dietelmaier, 202.
Dietenberger, 18.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 4.
Dioscurus, 111.
Dobel, 182.
Doedes, 194.
Döllinger, 196, 232.
Donovan, 196.
Dorner, 113, 115, 139, 349.
Dositheus, 200 *seq.*
Dowden, 193.
Dubois, 222.
Duchesne, 85.
Dunlop, 194.
Duns Scotus, 139, 224, 389.
Dupanloup, 232.
Du Pin, 18, 196.
Durandus, 5.
Durie, 22.

Ebart, 9.
Eck, 8, 152, 166, 167, 176, 178, 181, 187 *seq.*
Edward VI, 191, 192.
Edwards, Jonathan, 245, 374, 376.
Egli, 170.
Elipandus, 130.
Elizabeth of England, 192, 211, 396.
Ellis, 192.
Emlyn, 242.
Epiphanius, 60, 75, 77, 87, 89 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*
Episcopius, 211 *seq.*
Erasmus, 8, 20, 37, 147, 151, 158, 161, 170, 171, 339.
Ernesti, 5.
Erskine, 244.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 60, 67, 72, 75, 85 90, 91.
Eusebius of Dorylæum, 110.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 84.
Eutyches, 109 *seq.*, 117.

Faber, 169, 176, 178, 181.
Fabricius, 19.
Fagius, 191.
Farel, 183, 197.
Fausset, 193.
Fecht, 38.
Felix of Urgel, 130.
Fels, 182.
Ferdinand I, 20, 189, 198.
Ferdinand II, 198.
Ferdinand V, 159.
Fessler, 232.
Ffoulkes, 39.
Ficker, 180.
Field, 37.
Fisher, 160, 191.
Flacius, 337 *seq.*
Flavian, 110, 111.
Fletcher, 327.
Fontaine, 222.
Forbes, A. P., 192.
Forbes, John, 21.
Förstemann, 180.
Fossombrone, 182.
Fox, 160.
Francke, 244.
Frank, 206.
Franz, 180.
Frederick I, 244.
Frelinghuysen, 244.
Frere, 193.
Friedberg, 233.
Friedrich, 25, 232, 233.
Froment, 183.
Fromman, 233.
Froude, 196.

Gaberel, 194.
Gaetano da Thiene, 182.
Gairdner, 198.
Gale, 222.
Garrison, 193.
Gasquet, 193.
Gass, 39.
Gee, 193.
George of Saxony, 208.
Gerberon, 222.
Gerdes, 19.
Gernler, 214.
Giattino, 196.
Gieseler, 113, 161, 165, 171.

Gillespie, 219, 364.
Gindely, 199.
Gladstone, 233.
Glasius, 213.
Godkin, 195.
Goltz, Von der, 39.
Gomarus, 211, 378.
Gore, 293, 294.
Göschel, K. F., 206
Göschl, J., 196.
Graf, 212.
Granderath, 233.
Gratian, 8.
Gratry, 225.
Grebel, 170.
Green, E. T., 192.
Green, W. H., 380.
Gregory Nazianzen, 94.
Gregory of Nyssa, 94.
Gregory III, 40.
Gregory VII, 132.
Gropper, 8, 20, 184, 188, 189.
Grotius, 21, 211, 392.
Guericke, 26.
Guettée, 222.
Gumlich, 26.
Gustavus Vasa, 187.
Gwatkin, 92.

Haag, 215.
Hagenbach, 10, 185.
Hahn, 39.
Hales, 212.
Halifax, 234.
Hall, Joseph, 379.
Hall, Peter, 209.
Hammond, 38.
Hardwick, 192.
Hardy, 39.
Harms, 407.
Harnack, 39.
Harvey, 5, 38.
Hase, 19, 25.
Häusser, 150, 169.
Heber, 180.
Hedio, 175.
Hefele, 113, 230.
Hegel, 245, 247.
Heidegger, 38, 214.
Hemming, 8, 9.
Henderson, 215.
Henry VIII, 159 *seq.*, 170.
Heppe, 13, 206.
Heraclius, 119.
Hergenröther, 232.
Hering, 207.
Hermann of Cologne, 184, 185, 188.
Hermas, 42, 66, 326.
Heruetus, 196.
Heshusius, 358.
Hessels, 18.
Heurtley, 38.
Heylyn, 37, 212.
Hickman, 212.
Hilary of Arles, 100.
Hilary of Poitiers, 92, 94.
Hildebert of Tours, 7.
Hilgers, 26.
Hinschius, 233.
Hippocrates, 58.
Hippolytus, 52, 66.
Hobbes, 236.
Hodge, A. A, 380.
Hodge, Charles, 374.
Hoë of Hoënegg, 208.
Hofmann, 26.
Hofmeister, 8, 189.
Holsten, 38.
Honoratus, 100.
Honorius, 119, 120, 231.
Hooper, 37.
Höpfner, 208.
Hornejus, 202.
Hort, 39, 87.
Hortleder, 189.
Hosius of Cordova, 84, 92.
Hosius, S., 18.
Hospinian, 206.
Hottinger, 214.
Houssaie, 196.
Huber, 18.
Huller, 222.
Hülsemann, 208.
Hume, 238 *seq.*
Huss, 152, 166, 188, 198, 295.
Hutter, 12, 180, 206.

Ibas, 118.
Ignatius of Antioch, 51, 63, 66, 67, 70, 77.
Ignatius Loyola, 182.
Innocent I, 127.
Irenæus, 4, 8, 36, 41, 51 *seq.*, 60, 66, 67, 70, 72, 73, 75 *seq.*, 258.
Isselburg, 379.
Ittig, 38, 202.
Ivimey, 220.
Ivo of Chartres, 7.

Jablonski, 197.
Jacobs, 180.
James, the Apostle, 54, 69, 329.
James I, 192, 394, 395.
Jansen, 221, 222.
Jeremiah of Constantinople, 200.
Jerome of Prague, 198.
John, the Apostle, 51, 70, 280, 285, 291, 353.
John, the Baptist, 56, 58, 59, 66.
John of Antioch, 110, 111, 118.
John of Damascus, 7, 114, 116.
John XXII, 146.
John Scotus Erigena, 132.
Johnston of Warriston, 215.
Jonas, 175, 176.
Josephus, 44.
Jundt, 198.
Justin Martyr, 51 *seq.*, 57, 60, 66, 80.
Justinian, 8, 117, 118.

Kahnis, 259.
Kaiser, 180.
Kant, 245, 247.
Karg, 342.
Karsten, 26.
Kattenbusch, 25, 29, 31, 39, 63.
Keble, 249.
Keim, 182.
Kenrick, 232.
Ketteler, 232.
Kidd, 263.
Kihn, 10, 16.
Kimmel, 202.
King, 38.
Klee, 16.
Klein, 15.
Klener, 14.
Kliefoth, 279.
Klingius, 9.
Knaake, 177.
Knox, 193, 194.
Koecher, 180, 194, 196, 206.
Köllner, 15, 26, 179, 181.
Köstlin, 283.
Krauth, 179.
Krispin, 198.
Kromayer, 9.
Kunze, 39.

Labadie, 244.
Laing, 219.
Lamb, 192.
Lambert, 8.
Lanfranc, 132.
Langen, 233.
Lasco, 193.
Lathbury, 193.
Latomus, 189.
Laud, 192, 215, 216, 393.
Launoius, 225.
Laurentius, 209.
Lebeau, 180.
Lechler, 198.
Léger, 197.
Leibnitz, 22, 236.
Lenfant, 194.
Leo I, 107, 109, 111.
Leo III, 123.
Leo IX, 125.
Leo X, 163, 165.
Leo XIII, 233.
Leo Judae, 170.
Leontius of Byzantium, 114, 116.
Le Plat, 196.
Lessing, 238.
Leydecker, 222.
Leyser, 208.
Lightfoot, 218.
Lisco, 38.
Littledale, 196.
Locke, 236.
Loisy, 234.
Loofs, 26, 29, 31.
Lucar, Cyril, 201, 202.
Lucchesinus, 222.
Lucian, 60.
Ludolph of Saxony, 5.
Luke, 53, 54, 58, 62, 68.
Lumby, 39.
Luther, 5, 8, 11, 12, 37, 147, 151 *seq.*, 156 *seq.*, 161 *seq.*, 180, 183 *seq.*, 187, 189, 198, 203, 204, 208, 256, 262, 267, 268, 271, 272, 274, 278, 281, 283, 299, 303, 305, 313, 316, 318, 320, 327, 337 *seq.*, 341, 343 *seq.*, 353, 357, 368, 407.
Lutzenburgus, 18.

Maccabeus, Judas, 329.
Major, 189, 344.
Malderus, 212.
Manning, 232, 233, 249.
Manutius, 196.
Manz, 170.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 40, 75, 97.
Maret, 232.
Marheinecke, 16, 24, 25.
Maris, 118.

Marshall, Stephen, 377, 378.
Marshall, W., 198.
Martene, 190.
Martin I, 119.
Martin V, 152.
Martin, C., 233.
Martinius, 379.
Mary the Virgin, 41, 52, 54, 58, 60, 88, 96, 106, 109, 111, 130, 133, 223 *seq.*, 308.
Maskell, 192.
Matthes, 26.
Maximilian II, 198.
Mayer, 196.
McGiffert, 39, 238, 239.
McGlothlin, 220.
McGready, 248.
Melanchthon, 8, 11, 20, 37, 168, 173, 175 *seq.*, 184 *seq.*, 193, 203, 204, 313, 318, 339, 341, 344, 345, 347, 349, 350, 353, 355, 357.
Melchizedek, 290, 334.
Meldenius, Rupertus, 21, 412.
Meletius Syriga, 201, 202.
Melius, 194.
Memnon of Ephesus, 110.
Mendham, 196.
Mensing, 188.
Mentzer, 180.
Menzel, 4.
Mess, 13.
Metrophanes Critopulus, 202.
Meurer, 186.
Meyers, 38.
Michael Cærularius, 125.
Michalcescu, 202.
Migetius, 130.
Miltitz, Charles v., 165.
Mitchell, 219.
Mogilas, 200 *seq.*
Möhler, 24, 25, 28, 318, 319.
Molinaeus, P., 212.
Molinos, Miguel de, 221.
Montfaucon, 38.
More, Sir Thomas, 159 *seq.*, 191.
Moritz of Saxony, 190.
Morland, 197.
Mücke, 39.
Müller, C. G., 190.
Müller, E. F. K., 26, 29.
Müller, J. J., 180.
Müller, K., 13, 182.
Musaeus, 206.
Musculus, 204.
Muston, 197.
Myconius, 175, 185.

Nausea, 20, 189.
Neale, 222.
Neander, 25, 113, 257, 258.
Nestorius, 109 *seq.*, 115, 117, 127.
Neuberger, 208.
Neven, 194.
Newman, 249.
Niceta of Remesiana, 37, 78, 81.
Nicholas I, 125, 136.
Nicholas V, 123, 142, 143.
Nicholas, J. S., 220.
Nicolas, M., 38.
Nicolaus of Methone, 139.
Niemeyer, 13.
Nitzsch, 25, 283.
Normann, 202.
Nösgen, 26.

Occhino, Bernardino, 161, 191.
Œcolampadius, 175, 185.
Oehler, 26.
Olearius, 9.
Olevianus, 193.
Origen, 41, 55, 60, 66, 159.
Osiander, Andreas, 175, 313, 341 *seq.*, 370.
Osiander, Lucas, 18, 204.
Otto, J. C. T., 202.

Palacky, 197.
Paleotto, 196.
Pallavicini, 196.
Palmer, Herbert, 217.
Panzer, 180.
Pareus, 4, 37.
Parker, Matthew, 192.
Passaglia, 225.
Pastor, 187, 188, 189, 313, 318.
Patton, 378, 381.
Pätzold, 182.
Paul, the Apostle, 50 *seq.*, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 68 *seq.*, 79, 81, 124, 129, 156, 157, 164, 269, 280, 285 *seq.*, 290, 291, 353, 376.
Paul of Samosata, 4, 8, 83 *seq.*, 92, 99.
Paulus, C., 9.
Pearson, 37.
Pelagius, 127, 224.
Pelargus, 207.
Peltius, 212.
Perkins, 37, 210, 211.

Perrin, 197.
Perrone, 225.
Pescheck, 199.
Peter, the Apostle, 43, 47, 50, 51, 55, 62, 64, 65, 69 *seq.*, 81, 124, 152, 156, 229 *seq.*, 269, 280, 285, 353.
Peter Lombard, 7, 135, 294, 342.
Petri, 187.
Pezel, 207.
Pfaff, C. M., 186, 214.
Pfaff, K., 180.
Pfeffinger, 340.
Pflug, Julius von, 20, 188 *seq.*
Philip of Hesse, 175.
Philippi, F. A., 26.
Philo, 84.
Photius, 125, 126, 136.
Pichler, A., 202.
Pichler, V., 19.
Pickering, 192.
Pierce, 242.
Pighius, 18, 189.
Pilate, Pontius, 42, 52, 60, 61, 88.
Pipping, 206.
Pirminius, 40.
Pistorius, 188.
Pitman, 218.
Pius II, 152.
Pius IV, 195.
Pius V, 195.
Pius VII, 223.
Pius IX, 14, 223, 225, 232, 234, 235.
Pius X, 14, 223, 225, 233 *seq.*
Placeus, 213, 214.
Planck, 24.
Plato, 154, 247.
Plitt, 26, 180.
Polanus, 196.
Praxeas, 49.
Preger, 190.
Pressensé, 233.
Pressius, 198.
Proctor, 193.
Proles, 161.
Pullan, 193.
Pullein, 7.
Pusey, 249.

Quesnel, Paschasius, 221, 222.
Quick, 194.
Quirinus, 232.

Radbertus, Paschasius, 132.
Radcliffe, 38.
Rambach, 19, 196.
Ratramnus, 132.
Rausch, 180.
Rauwenhoff, 195.
Rechenberg, 9, 15, 206.
Regenboog, 213.
Reid, 219.
Reinkens, 232.
Renan, 246.
Resch, 53.
Reuchlin, H., 222.
Reuchlin, J., 151, 158
Révillant, 38.
Revius, 194.
Reynolds, 364.
Rhegius, Urbanus, 8, 37.
Ricard, 222.
Richey, 39.
Richter, 196.
Riederer, 9.
Ritschl, 246.
Robertson, 202.
Robinson, 212.
Rogers, 192.
Roget, 194.
Rogge, 213.
Roskovány, 225.
Rudelbach, 38, 180.
Rudolph II, 198.
Rufinus, 3, 4, 36, 37, 40, 63, 64, 75.
Rutherford, 212.
Ryves, 403.

Sabellius, 49, 83, 99.
Sadoleto, 161.
Sainte-Aldegonde, 25.
Salig, 180, 196.
Salnar, 12, 209.
Samson, 169.
Sanday, 39.
Sanden, 15.
Sarpi, 196.
Sartorius, 25.
Savonarola, 149, 161.
Schaff, 10, 39, 40, 113, 175, 179, 180, 195, 233, 258 *seq.*, 272, 282, 283, 337, 341, 344, 349, 350.
Scheeben, 233.
Schéele, 26.
Schelling, 245.
Schelstrate, 202.
Schirrmacher, 180.
Schleiermacher, 246, 247, 257, 258, 407.
Schmid, 190.
Schmidt, H., 26.

Schneckenburger, 25.
Schnepf, 187.
Schotel, 194.
Schubert, 19.
Schulte, 196, 232, 233.
Schwab, 38.
Schwane, 131, 132.
Schweizer, 215.
Schwenckfeld, 313.
Scott, 213.
Seaman, 377, 378.
Séche, 222.
Selnecker, 204, 206.
Semisch, 39.
Sergius of Constantinople, 119.
Servetus, 184.
Sickel, 196.
Sigismund, 207.
Simeon, 54.
Simson, 243.
Smets, 196.
Smith, H. B., 376.
Smith, Thomas, 202.
Smyth, John, 402.
Soto, Dominico, 159.
Spener, 9, 244.
Speroni, 38.
Spinola, 22.
Spinoza, 236.
Spottiswoode, 194.
Sprott, 193.
Stancaro, 342.
Stanley, 30, 39.
Stapferus, 19.
Staupitz, 151, 161.
Stephen of Austria, 198.
Stephens, A. J., 193.
Stevens, C. E., 193.
Strauss, 246.
Streitwolf, 14.
Strigelius, 9.
Sturm, 174, 175.
Sudhoff, 194.
Suicer, 38.
Swainson, 38.
Swete, 39, 63.
Szalay, 195.

Tafel, 25.
Taverner, 179.
Tennent, 244.
Tentzel, 38.
Tertullian, 4, 8, 36, 41, 48, 49, 51 *seq.*, 60, 63, 66, 67, 70, 72, 73, 76, 79, 80, 280.
Tetzel, 162 *seq.*, 303.
Theiner, 196.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 118.
Theodoret, 118.
Theodorus of Cæsarea, 118.
Theodosius, 86, 111.
Theodotus, the Currier, 48.
Thomas, the Apostle, 50.
Thomas, L., 197.
Travers, 215, 394.
Tregelles, 222.
Tschackert, 19, 180.
Turmel, 7, 10.
Turrecremata, 225.
Turrettin, 16, 19, 214, 378.
Twesten, 258.
Twisse, 379.
Tyrrel, 234.

Ullathorne, 225.
Ullmann, 139.
Underhill, 220.
Ursinus, 193, 206.
Ussher, 37, 215, 395, 396.
Uytenbogaert, 211.

Valentia, 18.
Van Wyk, 222.
Varemius, 180.
Vasquez, 18.
Vedel, 212.
Veltwick, 188.
Venantius Fortunatus, 64.
Vermigli, Peter Martyr, 8, 9, 161, 162, 191, 347, 358.
Veuillot, 232.
Victor, Pope, 48.
Vincent of Lérins, 100, 101, 412.
Vines, 377, 378.
Vinke, 194.
Viret, 183.
Visconti, 196.
Vittoria, 159.
Vossius, 5, 37.

Walch, C. G. F., 38.
Walch, J. E. I., 38.
Walch, J. G., 8, 171, 173, 187, 189, 206.
Walker, W., 220
Wallis, 37.
Ward, 379.
Warfield, 381.
Warham, 160.
Waterland, 38.

Waterworth, 196.
Weber, 180.
Weissenborn, 202.
Wernsdorff, 182.
Wesley, 244, 321, 330.
Wessenberg, 196.
Westphal, 347.
Whitakers, 364.
Whitfield, 244.
Wimpina, 187.
Winer, 24, 25.
Wirgmann, 193.
Witsius, 38.
Witzel, 20.
Wladislaus, 208.
Wolsey, 159, 160.
Wycklif, 152, 188, 197, 295.
Wyttenbach, 19.

Ximenes, 159.

Zaccaria, 182.
Zahn, 39, 53.
Zanchius, 358.
Zeltner, 212.
Zeno, 117.
Zephyrinus, 48.
Zezschwitz, 38.
Zinzendorf, 199, 244.
Zirngiebl, 233.
Zöckler, 39, 180.
Zorn, 207.
Zosimus, 127.
Zwingli, 12, 151, 155, 161, 169, 170, 173 *seq.*, 178, 180 *seq.*, 208, 209, 260, 263, 272, 282 *seq.*, 296, 331, 332, 334, 347.

The International Theological Library

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of the Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England, and the Rev. OWEN WHITEHOUSE, B.A., Principal and Professor of Hebrew, Chestnut College, Cambridge, England.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., President and Professor of Hebrew, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland. [*Now Ready.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leipzig. [*Now Ready.*

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT, D.D., Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By FRANK C. PORTER, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. By G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH. By ROBERT RAINEY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

THE LATIN CHURCH FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. [*Author to be announced later.*

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES. By W. F. ADENEY, D.D., Principal of Independent College, Manchester. [*Now Ready.*

THE REFORMATION. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D., Principal of the United Free College, Glasgow. [*2 vols. Now Ready.*

CHRISTIANITY IN LATIN COUNTRIES SINCE THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. By PAUL SABATIER, D.Litt., Drome, France.

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By GEORGE GALLAWAY, D.D., Minister of United Free Church, Castle Douglas, Scotland.

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. I. China, Japan, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India, Persia, Greece, Rome. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. [*Now Ready.*

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University.

APOLOGETICS. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD. By WILLIAM N. CLARKE, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamilton Theological Seminary. [*Now Ready.*

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. By WILLIAM P. PATERSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST. By H. R. MACKINTOSH, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University. [*Now Ready.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, New Haven. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR AND THE WORKING CHURCH. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. [*Now Ready.*

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER. By A. E. GARVIE, D.D., Principal of New College, London, England.

The International Critical Commentary

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THE OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS. The Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England. [*Now Ready.*

EXODUS. The Rev. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.

LEVITICUS. J. F. STENNING, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

NUMBERS. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

DEUTERONOMY. The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

JOSHUA. The Rev. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen.

JUDGES. The Rev. GEORGE MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

SAMUEL. The Rev. H. P. SMITH, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

KINGS. The Rev. FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D., President and Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

CHRONICLES. The Rev. EDWARD L. CURTIS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH. The Rev. L. W. BATTEN, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

PSALMS. The Rev. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*2 vols. Now Ready.*

PROVERBS. The Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

JOB. The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

ISAIAH. Chaps. I–XXVII. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ISAIAH. Chaps. XXVIII–XXXIX. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D. Chaps. LX–LXVI. The Rev. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Victoria University and Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester, England.

JEREMIAH. The Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Dean of Ely, sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, England.

EZEKIEL. The Rev. G. A. COOKE, M.A., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, University of Oxford, and the Rev. CHARLES F. BURNEY, D.Litt., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Oxford.

DANIEL. The Rev. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., D.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City.

AMOS AND HOSEA. W. R. HARPER, Ph.D., LL.D., sometime President of the University of Chicago, Illinois. [*Now Ready.*

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH AND JOEL. Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, University of Chicago; W. HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D., Editor of *The Independent*, New York; Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI AND JONAH. Prof. H. G. MITCHELL, D.D.; Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, Ph.D., and Prof. J. A. BEWER, Ph.D. [*Now Ready.*

ESTHER. The Rev. L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary. [*Now Ready.*

ECCLESIASTES. Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Pa. [*Now Ready.*

RUTH, SONG OF SONGS AND LAMENTATIONS. Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

ST. MATTHEW. The Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ST. MARK. Rev. E. P. GOULD, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Literature, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. [*Now Ready.*

ST. LUKE. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., sometime Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

ST. JOHN. The Right Rev. JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ireland.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and the Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.

ACTS. The Rev. C. H. TURNER, D.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

ROMANS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Principal of King's College, London.
[*Now Ready.*

I. CORINTHIANS. The Right Rev. ARCH ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

II. CORINTHIANS. The Rev. DAWSON WALKER, D.D., Theological Tutor in the University of Durham.

GALATIANS. The Rev. ERNEST D. BURTON, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago.

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS. The Rev. T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, now Librarian of the same. [*Now Ready.*

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON. The Rev. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

THESSALONIANS. The Rev. JAMES E. FRAME, M.A., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
[*Now Ready.*

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Rev. WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College and Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

HEBREWS. The Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland.

ST. JAMES. The Rev. JAMES H. ROPES, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism in Harvard University.

PETER AND JUDE. The Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
[*Now Ready.*

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES. The Rev. E. A. BROOKE, B.D., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer in King's College, Cambridge. [*Now Ready.*

REVELATION. The Rev. ROBERT H. CHARLES, M.A., D.D., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin.

JKM LIBRARY
1100 E. 55th Street, Chicago, IL 60615

Date Due Slip

Please keep this receipt with this item and do not lend this item to anyone else. Return or renew item by due date noted below. Item may be renewed online at www.jkmlibrary.org (click "My Account" tab and enter 14-digit library card barcode number, with no spaces), in person, by phone (773-256-0739), by fax (773-256-0737) or by e-mail (circdesk@lstc.edu)

Transaction Date: 05/03/06 05:23PM
****

Due Date: 08/02/06
Item Barcode: 3996700201
Theological symboli
us Briggs.

Call. No

BT
990
.B7